

A
C R I T I C I S M
U P O N
M O D E R N N O T I O N S
O F
S A C R I F I C E S,
B E I N G

An EXAMINATION of Dr. TAYLOR's Scripture-
Doctrine of ATONEMENT examined,

I N R E L A T I O N

I. To JEWISH SACRIFICES.

II. To the SACRIFICE of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

T O W H I C H I S A D D E D

A n A P P E N D I X,

C O N T A I N I N G

An EXAMINATION of another notion of JEWISH
SACRIFICES, which is exhibited in an anonymous
Piece, published at LONDON, ann. 1746. and in-
titled, *An Essay on the nature, design, and origin of*
SACRIFICES.

Decipimur specie recti.—HOR.

Ficta omnia celeriter, tanquam flosculi, decidunt.—TULL.

Πάντα δοκιμάζει, τὸ καλὸν κατέχει. St. Paul.

L O N D O N :

Printed for C. HENDERSON, under the Royal-Exchange;
T. BECKET and P. A. de HONDT, in the Strand. 1761.

1609/3170




ADVERTISEMENT.

TH E reader will perceive that the learned and worthy Dr. *Taylor* was living when the following examination of his notions of atonement was finished. I hoped that it might have reached his hands in this world, and that the publication of it would have suggested reasons to him for favouring us with his second thoughts on that subject. However, his death doth not supersede the main design of this publication, which is to promote truth, that lives forever, and will be immortal.



T H E
P R E F A C E.

 *NATURAL* aversion to polemical writing, and the great esteem I have for Dr. Taylor, had long detained me from engaging in a criticism upon his notions of sacrifice, still hoping to see this work undertaken and executed by some abler hand. But being hitherto disappointed in this expectation, and my disinclination out-weighed by the consideration of the venerable nature of sacrifice, and of the great interest which the bulk of mankind have always taken themselves to have in the effect of it, but, above all, by a concern for truth; have at last engaged in it. And having finished what I proposed, do now lay it before the public, and submit the

A 3 criticism

FROM THE LIBRARY

Rev. OWEN THOMAS, D. D.

LIVERPOOL.

PURCHASED AND PRESENTED BY

criticism to the judgment of those who are qualified for judging in affairs of this nature.

About the time I was entering upon this work, an anonymous piece, entitled, An essay upon the nature, design, and origin of sacrifices, was put into my hands by a friend: in which I found a notion, different from Dr. Taylor's, of the symbolical nature and design of Jewish sacrifices, exhibited and defended. Wherefore, that I might, at once, shew the vanity, absurdity, and falshood of all notions of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, I judged it proper, to take some notice of this performance. And accordingly, an appendix is subjoined containing a critical examination of this Author's notion of the symbolical nature of these sacrifices, and of whatever he has advanced in its support.

*Notwithstanding what the last mentioned Author has said to the contrary, it doth not appear to me, that peace-offerings were in use before the days of Moses. And as the sacrifices of this species were, in respect of the offerers, voluntary oblations, and accompanied either their prayers for the grant of blessings, or their thanksgivings for blessings received; 'tis easy to see, what was the use and design of them, and to account rationally for the institution and practice of them: for this may be
done,*

P R E F A C E.

vii

done, only by considering the oblation of those sacrifices as proper actions, whereby the offerers did, in a natural way, express the piety of mind with which they prayed for the grant of blessings, or the sincerity and greatness of the inward gratitude with which they commemorated, and gave thanks for, blessings already received. Hence it is, that we find little controversy, or diversity of opinion, about the use, design, and rationale of those sacrifices, among the bulk of those who have written about them.

Piacular sacrifice was of a more ancient date, and is of more permanent duration, than eucharistical sacrifice: for, according to the reports of revelation, it takes place under the present dispensation of religion, and was in practice under all past dispensations of it, ever since the lapse of our first parents, and the effect of it is to have place in that future, celestial dispensation of it, which is to have no end. This is what renders it very interesting, and a matter of great importance, to mankind, to have a right understanding of the true use, design, and rationale of this species of sacrifice.

The oblation of this species of sacrifice was not left to the discretion or choice of the offerers. In all cases, it was exacted from them

by divine authority and peremptory command. And, in many cases, it was not only a demand made upon them for sins which they had committed, but likewise, the means by which atonement was made for these sins, and the pardon of them obtained. Wherefore, however desirable and interesting it is to mankind, to have a clear and right understanding of the use, design, and rationale of piacular sacrifice, yet the effect, which is ascribed to it, creates some difficulty in coming at it; it being not easy to comprehend what end, in respect of God, the exacting of sacrifice for sin could answer, or how the oblation of sacrifice should be the mean of obtaining the pardon of sin.

A sense however, of the interesting nature and great importance of the discovery, has been a motive to many men of good sense and great learning, to employ their thoughts and pens in clearing up this difficulty. And, indeed, many volumes have been written with that view. But alas! the success in this attempt, has, in no degree, been answerable to the great pains which have been taken in making it. The writers on this subject have not yet arrived at any certainty, or to any agreement among themselves, about the point in question. The difficulty attending the inquiry, and the false scents upon which they have been put by a false philosophy, preconceived hypotheses,

ses, or a too liberal indulgence of fancy and imagination, have led them into diverse systems, and trains of thoughts, which are as incompatible with each other, as they are all likewise, in my apprehension at least, with the doctrine of revelation, and the dictates of common sense.

The popular notion of piacular-sacrifice, which has long prevailed, is that which proceeds upon the supposition of a transfer of guilt from the offerer to the sacrifice, and of vicarious punishment. But this notion of the use and design of piacular sacrifice has, by Dr. Taylor, the Author of the essay on the nature, design, and origin of sacrifices, and others, been demonstrated to be wholly unsupported by scripture-evidence, absurd in itself, and attended with ill consequences. For which reason, they who make the scriptures the sole rule of religious faith, or will be guided by the dictates of common sense, must, if they act a consistent part, resign this notion of the use and design of piacular sacrifice, as unscriptural, absurd, and dangerous.

To supply the place of this exploded notion of the use and design of piacular sacrifice, two others have, of late been offered to us; the one, by the learned Dr. Taylor, who considers piacular sacrifices as being symbols, or emblems of penitent

penitent disposition, and penitential address or prayer to God; and accounts for the efficacy and effect of them in the same manner, as for those of penitence and penitent prayer. The other notion of the use and design of this species of sacrifice, is, that which is advanced by the Author of the before-mentioned essay on the nature, design, and origin of sacrifices, who considers eating and drinking with God to have been the main intention of all sorts of sacrifices; and conceives this eating and drinking together to have been a symbol of friendship betwixt God and the offerers, and a fæderal rite whereby he and they did engage in, renew, and keep up friendship with one another.

These two notions of the nature and design of piacular sacrifices agree in this, that they make these sacrifices to be symbols or emblems. But then, the things of which they make them symbols, are of such a different nature, that the one or other of them must be false. Yea, as each of the mentioned Authors, grounds his notion of the symbolical nature of these sacrifices upon scripture evidence, and yet differ so widely in their sentiments about the use and design of them, this gives reason to suspect, that scripture-evidence, for the symbolical nature of piacular sacrifices is very obscure and doubtful, if not quite deficient: for had it been clear, or, in any perceptible degree, probable, men of their parts
and

and learning, and so free from prejudice, must have not only discovered it, but been led, by the discovery, to an harmony of sentiments. 'Tis, therefore, much to be questioned, whether the scriptures give any countenance at all to the conceiving of sacrifices, as having a symbolical nature and design; and whether all notions of this kind may not be groundless, and rather the effects of a lively and luxuriant imagination, than the result of any real evidence.

What then is now to be done, in this dark and perplexed case? Nothing, surely, but to examine each of these two notions of the symbolical nature and design of piacular sacrifice, and to try whether they have, or have not, any real foundation in scripture-evidence, or in truth and common sense. I know of no one ill consequence that can arise from free, candid, and sober inquiry, among reasonable men; and, I am sure, that it is the only way of coming at truth. We have been fairly stript of the possession of the common and popular notion of the use and design of piacular sacrifice by the ingenious, learned, and commendable labours of the two Authors mentioned: and two other notions of them are offered in place of it. But let us beware of receiving them without due scrutiny and careful examination, lest we should be led, a second time, into error and mistake,
by

by the doctrines of fallible men; and imbibe new notions of sacrifice as unscriptural, and wide of truth, as the old one, which we have been compelled to resign.

In the course of the following criticism, upon the works of these two Authors which treat of this subject, I have, I think, made it evident, that the notions of the symbolical nature of sacrifices, exhibited by them, are utterly unsupported by scripture-evidence, and both of them chargeable with absurditys and ill consequences; and, particularly, that the one, which is advanced by the Author of the essay on the nature, design, and origin of sacrifices, is such, as can, by no means, be brought to any agreement with the manner of the oblation and disposal of piacular sacrifices.

To my criticism upon Dr. Taylor's notion of the meaning and design of Jewish-sacrifices, I have subjoined an examination of his sentiments about the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ; which appear to me to be no less uncommon, than unsupported by scripture-evidence.

*In the execution of this whole work, I have used all just freedom: and have, every where, studied to express my sentiments in a plain, intelligible, and unartful manner; and to
say*

say nothing but what is pertinent, and necessary to set the subject in a just and clear light. I have, likewise, been particularly careful to give a fair and just representation of the sentiments of my Authors, in their own words; and to guard against every offence against good manners. How far I have succeeded in my design, I leave to be determined by those who have a capacity for judging in the affair.

If it should be objected here, what end can the being at so much pains and labour, in pulling down false schemes, answer? Had it not been much better to have favoured the world with the true one? To this I answer, that false schemes, plausibly and artfully erected, blind the human mind; and, therefore, must be demolished and removed out of the way, before the truth, symmetry, and beauty of that which is the true one, can be properly attended to, and duely perceived. The rubbish which covers any old foundation, must be removed, before the foundation itself can be seen, or any building erected upon it with safety and firmness: and the greater the quantity of rubbish is, the more labour, in proportion, must there be bestowed in clearing it away, or the builder cannot proceed wisely, and with any rational prospect of success. The more avenues to error and falsehood

hood are shut up, the more quickly and readily doth that, which leads to truth, discover itself.

But it may be said, the common, popular notion of sacrifice has, it seems, been discovered to be a cheat; and the new ones, which have been offered to supply its place, are deemed to be a lie; what then must men do in the mean time? How are they to regulate their faith, with regard to sacrifice?—

*ANSW. The scriptures are the alone repository of revealed truth, and of all true, religious faith: for which reason, men ought to search them carefully and diligently, untill they have discovered, from them, what they are to believe in this affair. In these sacred volumes alone, a declaration is made, and a description given, of the true end, design, and use of sacrifice. And whosoever applieth himself, with due care, and a fair and honest mind, to the study of them, and is so happy as to be led, by them, into a right train of thoughts, will, most certainly, discover the true end, design, and use of sacrifice. And when he has once got the true scripture-notion of these, he will find it to be a notion that is abundantly supported by evidence, and will endure the severest scrutinys of right reason; a notion which carries no absurdity in it, nor draws any
ill*

ill consequence after it; a notion which, if I mistake not, will plainly point out the reason of the institution of piacular sacrifice, and of the continuance and use of it under all dispensations of religion, ever since the lapse of Adam; and, at the same time, shew, that this species of sacrifice doth, at present answer, and has, always answered, its real end and design, notwithstanding men's ignorance of, and many mistakes about the nature of it.

I affirm these things with the greater assurance, because the scripture-doctrine about the nature and design of sacrifices has been my particular study for many years, not only since, but before, the two pieces, which are the subject of this criticism, were made public. About the time that Dr. Taylor published his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined, I had some thoughts of publishing my sentiments on that subject: but, upon hearing that the Dr. was then about to communicate his thoughts upon it to the public, I gave up all thoughts of carrying my design into execution, even though I had collected many materials for the work; as not doubting, but the world and myself would receive full satisfaction in this affair from such an able hand. But, being fully satisfied, that the Dr. has not only failed in
the

the execution of his design, but even given us a wrong and unscriptural idea of the meaning, design, and end of sacrifices, I intend, if life and health are continued, to resume that work, put the materials of it in order, and make it public likewise, provided I find the world in any disposition to receive and encourage it.



A N



AN

EXAMINATION

O F

DR. TAYLOR'S ideas of the nature,
efficacy, and design of Sacrifices.

WHEN I join with the public,
in acknowledging Dr. Taylor's
great learning, and uncommon
abilities as a writer ; his inde-
fatigable diligence in searching
after truth, with a just and laudable disre-
gard to popular opinions and human systems;
and his exemplary candor and integrity in
communicating to the world the real and
genuine result of his useful inquiries ; I
only do justice to his character, without
any mixture of unmeaning compliment.
The freedom of thought, zeal for pure,
unadulterated revelation, immoveable attach-
ment to the interests of truth, and integrity

B

and

and courage in exposing error, however popular, which shine forth in his writings, raise in me an high esteem of his character, as they must in every ingenuous mind, which has a sense of true worth. After all, the *Dr.* with all these fine accomplishments, cannot be thought to be exempted from the common foible of fallibility. He has written many things well: but too much, for leaving room to think, that his valuable performances may not be blended with some mixture of involuntary error. And if any such errors should be found in them, or in the works of other eminent writers; these errors ought to be exposed, not only for the sake of truth, but because they are of a very infectious nature, and the consequences of them more permanent than those of the errors of ordinary writers are.

THE most exceptionable things, which I have yet met with in the *Dr's* excellent writings, are those which he has taught concerning the nature, efficacy, and design of Sacrifices, in his Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, and in his other writings.—These therefore, I propose to examine with candor, and just freedom. And if the rules of good manners be observed in the examination of them, I hope, the importance of the subject, and the *Dr's* prefatory caution to his reader, may be sufficient.



Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 3

cient to excuse me, both to him and the public, for this undertaking.

IN the piece just now mentioned, the *Dr.* examines the scripture-doctrine of atonement, 1st. In relation to Jewish sacrifices: And 2dly. In relation to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. I shall observe the same method in examining what the *Dr.* has taught, as scripture-doctrine, concerning these two sorts of sacrifice.

PART I.

Containing an examination of what Dr. Taylor has taught, in his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined, concerning the meaning, efficacy, and design of Jewish sacrifices.

§. I. **D**R. Taylor gives us the following definitions of Jewish sacrifices, viz. *Sacrifices were a symbolical address to God; intended to express before him the devotion, affections, dispositions, and desires of the heart, by significative and emblematical actions*^a. Again, *Sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God, expressing by outward signs, what is expressed in prayer and praise by words, or, in the course of life, by deeds*^b.

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. II. §. 24.

^b Ibidem, Chap. VI. §. 118.

4 *Dr. TAYLOR's Sentiments of* Part I.

§. 2. THESE two are the only definitions which the *Dr.* has given us of Jewish sacrifices. And it appears from them, that these sacrifices, in his idea of them, were symbols or emblems of prayer and praise, and of those internal affections and dispositions of the mind which are expressed by prayer and praise. Agreeably to this notion of sacrifice, he tells us, that piacular sacrifice "was a penitent address to God^c;" that is, the symbol or emblem of penitent address to him, or, which is the same thing, of repentance expressed by prayer.

§. 3. WHEN I consider the great mischief which has been already done, and may still be done, by indulging a luxuriant imagination, and multiplying symbols, emblems, types, or allegories, without any reason or necessity; I must confess, that I have no great opinion of the way of explaining scripture-doctrines by the help of such means as these, except where the scripture itself points them clearly out, and warrants the use of them. By this way of explaining scripture-doctrines, the true and genuine doctrines of revelation have been both obscured and misrepresented; endless, inexplicable mysteries set on foot, and propagated; the whole bible converted into figure and allegory; and numberless hot contentions

^c See Script. doc. of aton. Chap. II. § 28.

and

Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 5

and disputes about trifles, destructive of christian temper, raised and kept up in the church of Christ. And, indeed, is there any whim ever so ridiculous, or any doctrine ever so false or absurd, but what, by a free and liberal use of this single engine, may be fathered upon the holy scriptures, and even supported and defended by their authority? These considerations, methinks, should make christian divines, the rational ones especially, extremely cautious against introducing symbols, emblems, types, or allegories, in their explanations of scripture-doctrine, without clear warrant from the scripture itself, or from the nature and circumstances of the case. But the *Dr.* thinks, that he has abundance of scripture-evidence to support his idea of the emblematic nature of Jewish sacrifices. And as this is pretended, 'tis fit and reasonable, that we should carefully attend to every thing of this kind, which he has advanced, and give it a fair hearing and trial.

§. 4. BUT, before I enter upon this work, it will be proper to make the following observations concerning the nature of symbols or emblems, and the proper rules which are to be observed in interpreting the sense of figurative expressions in the holy scriptures, and other writings; which will be of great use to illustrate the criticisms and reasonings which occur in the course of this work.

6 Dr. TAYLOR's *Sentiments of* Part I.

Obs. I. SYMBOLS, or emblems, are representations of the things which are signified by them, or which they are made to stand for: so that they are of a representative nature.

Obs. II. SYMBOLS, or emblems, are of two kinds. (1.) *Natural.* (2.) *Artificial.*

1st. NATURAL symbols, or emblems, are such as carry in them a similitude or resemblance of the things of which they are representations. Thus pictures, statues, draughts of material things, &c. are natural symbols or emblems of those particular persons or things which they represent, as being real resemblances of them.

2^{dly}. ARTIFICIAL symbols, or emblems, are such as carry in them no resemblance of the things they represent, but are only made the signs or marks of them by custom and consent, or by arbitrary appointment. Thus the picture of a woman is the emblem either of a country, or of some moral virtue; and the figure of an horn is understood to be an emblem of plenty; thus also the rainbow was made an emblem of the covenant which God made with Noah; and circumcision a token, or symbol, of the covenant he made with Abraham.—The signification of these artificial symbols depends entirely on custom and consent, or arbitrary appointment; and can only be learned either by observation or information: for between them and the things

Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 7

things represented by them, there is no resemblance, from which their signification can be discovered.—The Jewish sacrifices, if they were symbols, must have been of this artificial kind, since there is no resemblance between them and the things of which they are supposed to have been symbols, from which their signification can be learned.—Now, as these sacrifices, or symbols were instituted by the Deity, their signification must have depended on his will and appointment; for which reason, neither the Jew himself, nor any other person, could ever have learned the signification of those sacrifices, if it had not been made known, at first, by divine revelation. This renders it highly probable, that the signification of these sacrifices, had they been of a symbolical nature, would have been particularly explained and declared by God himself; because, if it was not, the Jews could not have known it; consequently, these sacrifices could have answered no wise end, but would have been quite useless. Wherefore, since God has made no declaration of the symbolical signification of these sacrifices, either in the Books of Moses, or any where else, 'tis natural to think, that they had no such signification: consequently, that they were not instituted as symbols or emblems of things, of which the Jews neither knew, nor could know, any thing; but with a

view to serve some end, in the knowledge of which, reason and common sense, as well as their own law, would instruct them.

Obs. III. IN those allusions which we meet with in most kinds of writings, both sacred and profane, the thing, alluded to, is not always, nor often, intended, nor to be understood, as a symbol of the thing which is referred to, and illustrated by it: but more commonly and usually it is alluded to, only as a thing which has something, in one or more of its properties, that is naturally similar to those of the other. The occasions of making this observation are so frequent, that it is needless to waste any time, here, in the illustration of it; since all those, who have read books, with any judgment, must have often made it for themselves. I only mention it here, for the sake of the following inference, *viz.* That when we meet with an allusion in any writing, we are not presently to conclude, that the thing, alluded to, is a symbol or emblem of the thing which is referred to it; because it may be alluded to, not as a symbol or emblem, but only as having some natural property or quality of a similar kind.

Obs. IV. IN interpreting the sense of the holy scriptures, or of any other writing, the following rules ought to be strictly observed.

Rule

Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 9

Rule 1st. THE literal and obvious sense of the words and phrases ought, in no case, to be departed from, without some good reason, arising either from the texture and scope of the discourse; or from an evident necessity of departing from it, in order to render the sense good and coherent.

Rule 2d. WHEN reason, common sense, and the evident design of the writer, oblige us to depart from the literal sense, we should be careful to understand the word, or phrase, in that particular mode of rhetorical figure which was intended by the writer himself, and not in a different one.

WITHOUT a due attention to the first of these two rules, the plainest narratives of facts and doctrines, and the most literal reasonings, may be wholly converted into figure and allegory. And if a proper regard is not payed to the second, another mode of rhetorical figure may be substituted in place of the true one, intended by the writer; an allusion to some natural similitude in a thing, may be mistaken for an allusion to the thing itself, as a symbol or emblem of the thing which is referred to it. By which means, the true and genuine sense of the writer will be misrepresented.

Rule 3d. WHEN, in any passage of a book, a lower and more common rhetorical figure, is found to give a good sense to a word, or phrase, and such as is evidently subservient to

to the scope and design of the writer; it would be wrong, and against all reason, to have recourse to a higher and less common rhetorical figure, for the interpretation of that word, or phrase.—The reason of this rule of interpretation is next to self-evident, and needs no illustration.

§. 5. TAKING the lights, afforded by the foregoing observations, in my hand, I now proceed to examine the scripture-evidence which the *Dr.* has produced, in order to prove, That Jewish sacrifices were symbols or emblems of address to God, and of those dispositions of mind which are expressed by *Prayer* and *Praise*.—The scripture-evidence, which the *Dr.* brings in support and proof of this point, is taken

First, FROM the way and manner in which the scriptures speak of *Sacrifice* and *Sacrificing*, in those passages which have no relation to Jewish or Levitical sacrifices.

Secondly, FROM the account which the scriptures gives us of the nature of *such Atonements* as were not made by Levitical sacrifices, but by other means.

I SHALL, therefore, examine whatsoever the *Dr.* has said under these two heads of evidence, separately.

CHAPTER I.

Containing an examination of the evidence which Dr. Taylor brings, from the way and manner in which the scriptures speak of Sacrifice and Sacrificing, in those passages which have no relation to Jewish sacrifices, in order to prove, that Jewish or Levitical sacrifices were symbols of Prayer and Praise, and of those dispositions, affections and desires of the mind which are expressed by Prayer and Praise.

§. 1. **D**R. Taylor introduces this branch of evidence with the following observation, *viz.* “ As the Levitical law sup-
 “ plieth no answer to this question, In
 “ what manner had sacrifices respect to
 “ God? we must seek for it in other parts
 “ of scripture; and consult the sense of
 “ prophets and apostles, who had a clear
 “ and full knowledge of the nature and
 “ ends of divine institutions; which, in
 “ such cases, is a just and authentic method
 “ of discovering and ascertaining the truth.”
 To illustrate this, he subjoins, “ In the
 “ institution of circumcision, Gen. xvii.
 “ no account is given of that religious
 “ rite, any farther than as it was a token
 “ of the covenant God then made with
 “ Abraham. But if we look into the pro-
 “ phetic

" phetic and apostolic writings, (Deut. x.
 " 16—xxx. 6. Jer. iv. 4. Rom. ii. 29.
 " Col. ii. 11.) we shall find it had rela-
 " tion to the heart, and signified the re-
 " trenching inordinate affections, or *the*
 " *putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*,
 " in order to dispose the mind to the
 " sincere love and obedience of God.
 " Every considerate person will allow this
 " account to be so far satisfactory. And
 " I doubt not, but evidence of the same
 " kind will appear more abundantly full
 " and clear in the case before us, if we
 " attend to the following considerations ^a."

R E M A R K S.

§. 2. THE *Dr.* here intimates, that the
 prophets and apostles, when they speak of
 circumcision as having relation to the heart,
 teach us something about the meaning
 of that rite, that was not expressed by its
 being called a token of the covenant between
 God and Abraham. But in this, I think,
 the *Dr.* is mistaken.—The covenant which
 God made with Abraham, like all other
 covenants between God and man, laid an
 obligation on Abraham *to walk before God,*
and be perfect; or, which is the same thing,
 to cultivate purity of heart and life. Cir-

^a Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
 Chap. II. §. 19.

circumcision was a token of this covenant; a visible and permanent mark, made in the flesh of Abraham and his posterity, as a memorial of it, in order to revive, and keep up, in their minds, from time to time, serious thoughts about that covenant of God with them, by the tenor of which they were bound and obliged to the practice of the strictest purity both of heart and life; and, as such, it had (in the *Dr's* phrase) a relation to the heart, even before any of the following prophets or apostles took notice of this relation. Abraham himself saw, and could not but see, that circumcision had such a relation to the heart: for was it possible for him, or for any other man, to consider it in another view, since it was a token, sign, or memorial of a covenant, by which he was bound to study purity of heart? When, therefore, prophets and apostles speak of circumcision as having a relation to the heart, they say no more about the meaning of that rite, than what God had, before, plainly intimated to Abraham, when he told him, that circumcision was a *token* of the covenant which he had made with him.

§. 3. THE *Dr.* having taken notice of this new explanation of circumcision, which he supposes to have been made by prophets and apostles, long after the institution of it, he subjoins, “ I doubt not but evidence of the
“ same

“ same kind will appear more abundantly
 “ in the case before us.” To this I reply,
 that if the *Dr.* proves his notions, about
 the meaning, efficacy, and design of Jewish
 sacrifices, were the notions which prophets
 and apostles had of them ; or, that there
 is as much evidence of the truth of these
 notions, as there is of circumcision's having
 a relation to the heart, every Christian ought,
 and every good Christian will, be ready to
 receive them as true and just notions : and
 if the evidence should happen to be more
 abundant in this than the other case, they,
 who do not yield to it, will be utterly in-
 excusable.—Let us, therefore, proceed to
 the examination of the scripture-evidence
 which the *Dr.* has produced in support of
 these notions.

Scripture-evidence produced by Dr. Taylor.

§. 4. “ THE Temple, says the *Dr.* where
 the sacrificial rites were solemnized, is called
 “ the *house of prayer*, *Isai. lvi. 7.* And with
 “ relation too to the sacrifices and burnt-
 “ offerings there offered. For so the Lord
 “ speaks, *All the sons of the stranger that*
 “ *join themselves to the Lord to serve him,—*
 “ *even them will I bring to my holy mountain,*
 “ (upon which the temple stood,) and
 “ *make them joyful in my house of prayer :*
 “ *their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices*
 “ *shall*

Chap. I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 15

"shall be accepted upon mine altar; for
"mine house shall be called an house of prayer
"for all people. Here prayer, or solemn
"address to God, and sacrifices, are terms
"equipollent. And it is farther observable,
"that the temple, here called of God an
"house of prayer, is also called of God an
"house of sacrifice, 2 Chron. vii. 12. *I have*
"*chosen this house to myself, for an house of*
"*sacrifice.* Incense was an emblem of
"prayer; see Luke i. 10. Rev. viii. 3, 4.
"And sacrifice too comes under the same
"notion of address to God, Psal. cxli. 2.
"*Let my prayer be set forth before thee as*
"*incense, and the up-lifting of my hands as*
"*the evening sacrifice^b.*"

EXAMINATION.

§ 5. IN this paragraph, the *Dr.* gives us two ideas of sacrifice, which seem to me to be inconsistent. He tells us, first, that sacrifices and prayer are terms equipollent: and then, towards the end of the paragraph, he says, that sacrifice comes under the same notion as incense, which, he tells us, was an emblem of prayer. Now these two ideas of sacrifice cannot be both true: for if sacrifice and prayer be equipollent terms, or words of the same signification,

^b See Scrip. doc. of Aton. Chap. II. §. 20.

it is not possible that sacrifice should be an emblem of prayer; for to conceive of it as such, would be to make it an emblem of itself. And how far it may be proper to admit such an absurd supposition as this, I shall leave to the determination of common sense. Moreover, if sacrifice and prayer are equipollent terms, I cannot see, how it is possible to make any common sense of the *Dr's* definition of sacrifice: for, upon this supposition, to say, that sacrifices were a symbolical address to God, is the same thing as to say, that prayer is a symbolical address or prayer to him; which, I think, will not be a good definition, either of sacrifice or prayer.——The inconsistency between these two ideas, which the *Dr.* gives us of sacrifice, is so glaring and evident, that one or other of them must be given up as indefensible. Let the *Dr.* consider which of them it will be most proper for him, to deliver up to this hard fate. Only it may not be amiss to take notice here, that, if he gives up the one of them, a great part of the scripture-evidence, which he has produced in support of his notion of sacrifice, will be foreign to his purpose, and quite useless to him; and that, if he gives up the other, a great part of that evidence will be directly against him. And how he can extricate himself from this dilemma, I cannot comprehend.

§. 6. HOWEVER, the *Dr.* insists on it, that the scripture itself considers sacrifice and prayer as being equipollent terms; and, as a proof of this, he refers us to *Isai. lvi. 7.* *All the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord to serve him,—even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.* And, as a farther proof of this notion of sacrifice, the *Dr.* takes notice, “that the temple, “which is called an *house of prayer* in “*Isaiah*, is called an *house of sacrifice*, “*2 Chron. vii. 12.*”—But, truly, when I have read over, and over again, all that the *Dr.* here advances, I can see nothing in it that can be any ground for his inference, *viz.* “that sacrifice and prayer are “equipollent terms.” So far am I from being able to find any thing of this nature in it, that I cannot conjecture, what the *Dr.* has grounded this inference upon.—The temple was God’s house, where he was worshipped both by prayer and the oblation of sacrifices: and, for this reason, it is sometimes called, God’s *house of prayer*, and, at other times, his *house of sacrifice*. From this way of speaking one may fairly and justly infer, that God’s *house of prayer*, and his *house of sacrifice*, was one house, or

C temple,

temple. But should any person take it into his head to infer from it, that prayer and sacrifice are equipollent terms, or words of the same signification, his reasoning, I think, would not be solid and convincing, but extremely weak and ridiculous. The weakness of this way of reasoning may, perhaps, be clearly exhibited by an example of it in a similar case; *e. g.* In the academy at *Warrington* are taught divinity, philosophy, mathematics, and languages. Now, if this academy, on account of these different sciences which are taught in it, should happen to be called by some, an house of divinity; by others, an house of philosophy; by others, an house of mathematics; and by others, an house of languages; these different ways of speaking of the same house would be very well understood: but if any person, upon hearing this academy, or house, called by these different names, should take it into his head to infer, that divinity, philosophy, mathematics, and languages, are equipollent terms, or words of the same signification, he would reason in the same way as the *Dr.* doth in the case before us; but his reasoning, I think, would not be much regarded.

§. 7. BUT the *Dr.* says, that "the temple is called (*Isa. lvi. 7.*) the *house of prayer*, in relation to, (I suppose, he means, on account of) the sacrifices and burnt-offerings there offered." The *Dr.*'s reasoning

ing from this passage in *Isaiah*, seems to me, to have been this, *viz.* In that passage, it is foretold, that the temple was to become an *house of prayer for all people*, for this reason, because God would there *accept of their sacrifices and burnt-offerings upon his altar*; which is a plain intimation that the temple was an *house of prayer*, as being an *house of sacrifices*; consequently, *prayer and sacrifice* must be terms equipollent, or words of the same signification. This, I think, is the way in which the *Dr.* must have reasoned from this passage, in order to come at his conclusion. But, in my opinion, 'tis a very wrong way of reasoning; and has nothing to support it, but a wrong construction of the last words of that passage, *viz.* *For my house shall be called an house of prayer for all people*; which words he connects, contrary to all reason, with those which go immediately before them, and which should be read in a parenthesis; and not with the more remote antecedent, with which alone they have a true and natural connection, as will be evident to any person who reads the whole passage thus, *All the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord to serve him,—even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; (their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on mine altar;)*

for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people. According to this construction, the words, in the last clause, are connected with those which are placed before the parenthesis; and the sense is easy and natural. But, according to the *Dr's* way of reasoning, they must be connected with those which are included in the parenthesis; by which means, indeed, the *Dr's* conclusion turns out, but the sense is forced and unnatural: for whatever *Dr. Taylor* may say, or an angel from heaven can say, to the contrary, sacrifice and prayer are two terms which stand for two very different ideas. And, methinks, the *Dr.* should not be over-fond of making sacrifice and prayer equipollent terms; since, if they are, his notion of sacrifices, as being symbolical addresses to God, must be directly and effectually destroyed: for if sacrifice and prayer be equipollent terms, sacrifice must be a literal, and not a symbolical, address to God. And, therefore, the *Dr.* should have suppressed this notion for his own sake.

§. 8. THE last thing, the *Dr.* affirms, in the foregoing paragraph, is, that sacrifice was an emblem of prayer. And, indeed, this comes up to his purpose, and will effectually do his business, provided the proof, which he brings of the truth of it, be found to be good. Let us then hear his scripture-
evi-

evidence on this head.—The only text the *Dr.* quotes, in this paragraph, as a proof of it, is, Psalm cxli. 2. *Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.*—Here, it is observable, that the psalmist, in this text, says nothing about sacrifice, as being a symbol of prayer; nor gives any manner of hint, from which such a notion of sacrifice can be fairly inferred. In the latter part of it, where he alludes to the evening-sacrifice, he doth not say one word about prayer; but only speaks of the *lifting up of his hands* in the performance of that duty. And the only thing he prays for, is, that the *lifting up of his hands*, in prayer, *might be set forth before God as the evening-sacrifice*: in which petition there is a manifest allusion to the evening-sacrifice which was burnt upon the altar, and ascended up towards heaven in a cloud of smoke; but not a word about sacrifices being an emblem of prayer. This text, therefore, comes not up to the *Dr.*'s purpose. However the *Dr.* has abundance of other scripture-evidence in store. And his next paragraph, which I now proceed to examine, is crowded with it.

Scripture-evidence, produced by Dr. Taylor,
continued.

§. 9. THE Dr. goes on with his scripture-evidence in the following manner, " This (i. e. this notion of sacrifices being a symbolical address to God) is implied " 1 Sam. xiii. 12. *Therefore, said I, the Philistines will come down upon me to Gilgal, and I have not made supplication to the Lord: I forced myself, therefore, and offered a burnt-offering.* Prov. xv. 8. *The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight.* Hence the bullocks offered in sacrifice, are sometimes elegantly put for verbal prayer, or address to God. Hos. xiv. 2. *Take with you words, and turn to the Lord, and say unto him, take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously: so will we offer up the bullocks of our lips.* Hence also such expressions as these, Psalm iv. 5. *Offer unto God the sacrifices of righteousness.* Psalm l. 14. *Sacrifice unto God thanksgiving.* ver. 23. *Whoso sacrificeth praise, glorifieth me.* Psalm li. 17. *The sacrifices of God are a broken heart.* 1 Pet. ii. 5. *Ye are an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable unto God.* Heb. xiii. 15. *By him let us offer up the sacrifice of praise to God*
" con-

“continually, that is, the fruit of our lips,
“giving thanks to his name.”

EXAMINATION.

§. 10. THE texts, contained in this paragraph of the *Dr.*'s book, are all quoted in order to prove, that sacrifices were symbolical or emblematical addresses to God, or, an address to him by symbol or emblem. And, in order to discover how far they amount to a proof of this point, I shall examine the first three of them separately, and the rest of them conjunctly.

§. 11. THE first text, which the *Dr.* exhibits as a proof of this point, is, 1 Sam. xiii. 12. *Therefore said I, the Philistines will come down upon me to Gilgal, and I have not made supplication to the Lord: I forced myself, therefore, and offered a burnt-offering.*—In these words, king Saul excuses himself to the prophet Samuel, for his having taken upon him to offer a burnt-offering, from the necessity he was brought under to make supplication to the Lord, by the danger wherewith he was threatened. And, from his excusing himself, after this manner, to the prophet, the *Dr.* would infer, “that
“burnt-offering was a symbol of supplica-

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. II. §. 21.

"tion," or, "that burnt-offering and supplication are equipollent terms." Let us then suppose, with the *Dr.* that king Saul, in this apology, used the word burnt-offering, in either of the two senses mentioned; and we shall presently see, how ridiculous the excuse which he made for his sin, must have appeared not only to Samuel, and to every other thinking person, but even to himself. If king Saul, in this apology, did really use the words, burnt-offering and supplication as synonymous terms, 'tis clear, that the thing for which he excuses himself, was no other, than his making supplication to the Lord, which, as it was not a sin, needed no apology. On the other hand, if king Saul, in this apology, made use of the term, burnt-offering, in the sense of its being a symbol of supplication; then the excuse, which he made for himself, was this, that the danger he was in, making it proper and requisite, that he should make supplication to the Lord, he, therefore, found himself under a necessity to offer up to the Lord, not supplication, but the symbol or emblem of it. Apologys these ridiculous enough! although king Saul was a very wicked person, yet he was a man of wit and understanding; and, therefore, cannot well be supposed to have made such apologys for his sin, as could have answered no end, but to expose his own folly, and his want of common

mon sense.—What I take to have been real fact in this case, is this; king Saul in his present danger, was desirous to obtain the pardon of his great sins, as fearing that they might now provoke God to deliver him, and his army, into the hands of the Philistines. The pardon of these sins, according to the rules of the law of Moses, was not to be obtained, but by a penitent confession of them, and prayer for pardon, in conjunction with the oblation of a piacular sacrifice: and, therefore, king Saul, as he had no priest with him, judged it necessary, both to make public confession and supplication, and, likewise, to offer a burnt-offering. And he thought, that the necessity of his affairs, in the present dangerous conjuncture, might excuse him to the prophet Samuel, and all reasonable men, for his invading the priest's office, on this occasion. And this is what he tells Samuel, as thinking that the motive, upon which he had acted, might justify what he had done. This interpretation of the text, or account of the case, is consistent with the method and means appointed by Moses for the expiation of sin: and it makes king Saul apologize for his sin, like a wicked man of wit and sense, and not like a fool or idiot: but it is no way favourable to the *Dr's* idea of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 12. The second text which the Dr. produceth as a proof of his point, is, *Prov. xv. 8. The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight.*—In these words, there is an antithesis between what is affirmed of the sacrifice of the wicked, and what is affirmed of the prayer of the righteous. And this antithesis seems to me, to have occasioned the Dr. to conceive, that sacrifice is mentioned as a symbol of prayer: for I can find nothing else in the words, that can be thought a ground for such an inference. But the Dr. ought to consider, that, if these antitheses, which occur in any writing, were to be interpreted after this manner, the interpretation would be very absurd and ridiculous. Let us only try this new way of interpretation upon some of the antitheses which occur in the same chapter, of which the text quoted is a part; and we shall presently perceive that the sense is rendered absurd and ridiculous by it. It is said, ver. 1. *A soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger.* ver. 2. *The tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright; but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness.* ver. 7. *The lips of the wise disperse knowledge; but the heart of the foolish doth not so.* ver. 15. *The heart of him that hath understanding seeketh knowledge; but the mouth of fools feedeth on folly.* ver. 18. *A*
wrath-

wrathful man stirreth up strife; but he that is slow to anger appeaseth strife; &c. &c. The antitheses, in each of these texts, is as clear and evident, as it is in that quoted by the *Dr.* Now should any person take it into his head to affirm, that the antitheses, in these several texts, are an intimation, that a *soft answer* is a symbol of *grievous words*; the *tongue of the wise*, of the *mouth of fools*; the *lips of the wise*, of the *heart of the foolish*; the *heart of him that understandeth*, of the *mouth of fools*; a *wrathful man*, of *him that is slow to wrath*; this person would think and reason in the same manner as the *Dr.* must be supposed to do here; but I need not say, how absurd and ridiculous his interpretation of these texts would appear to men of common sense: and yet he would have as much to say, in support of that interpretation, as the *Dr.* can be supposed to have to say, in support of his interpretation of the text under consideration.—But we need not go so far abroad for a confutation of the *Dr.*'s interpretation, since there is that in the text itself which fairly subverts it. The antithesis in the text, is not an antithesis between something that is said of sacrifice, and something that is said of prayer; but an antithesis between something that is said of the *sacrifice of the wicked*, and something that is said of the *prayer of the righteous*: and, therefore, if any thing can be inferred from

from this antithesis about the symbolical nature of sacrifice, it must be this, that *the sacrifice of the wicked* is a symbol of *the prayer of the righteous*; which is an absurdity so gross that it cannot be admitted; nor could it any way subserve the *Dr's* purpose, if it was admitted. The sense of this text appears to me to be this, *viz.* All the external dutys of religion which wicked men perform, even the most expensive, such as their sacrifices, are abominable and offensive to God: but all the external dutys of religion which good and righteous men perform, even those which are attended with no expence, such as prayer, are pleasing and acceptable to him. This interpretation is natural and unforced, and gives a sense to the words which is not only good but elegant. But it is so far from giving any countenance to the *Dr's* notion of Jewish sacrifices, that it supposes a very different notion of them. Upon the whole, I cannot see, how this text can be thought to serve the *Dr's* purpose in any respect.

§. 13. THE third text the *Dr.* mentions as a proof of his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, is Hof. xiv. 2. *Take with you words, and turn to the Lord, and say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we offer up the bullocks of our lips.* Here, the *Dr.* says, "Bullocks offered in sacrifice are elegantly
" put

“ put for verbal prayer, or address to God:” But in this, I think, he is mistaken; for if we substitute the words, verbal prayer, in place of the words, *bullocks of the lips*, the sense will not be good, at least, it will be very frivolous and uncommon. When this substitution is made, the passage will run thus,—*Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we offer up to thee verbal prayer.*—According to this reading, they promise to do for the future what they were doing at present, *viz.* to offer up verbal prayer to God; and with this promise, they enforce their prayer. This interpretation, to say the very best of it, gives us a very jejune and frivolous sense of the prophet’s words: and how consistent soever it may be thought to enforce prayer by a promise to pray on for the future, yet this doth not appear to be a very natural way of enforcing prayer; nor do I remember any instance we have of this way of proceeding in prayer, in holy scripture. Again, if, in this passage, the *bullocks of the lips* must be supposed to be symbolical of something, one would think that they should be symbolical rather of praise or thanksgiving, than of prayer; and that the bullocks, to which the allusion is made in this text, were those bullocks which were offered as sacrifices of thanksgiving, and not those which were offered for sin: for thus understood, the pas-

sage will have a good sense; *take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we offer unto thee the praises or thanksgivings of our lips.*—But the truth is, if it were any way necessary, to understand the phrase, *bullocks of the lips*, in a figurative sense, there is no need for understanding it in a sense so highly figurative as the Dr's, because a lower figurative sense will do as well, if not much better. Bullocks were ordered, by the law of Moses, to be offered as sacrifices of praise or thanksgiving. These sacrifices were not, as the Dr. imagines, symbols of praise or thanksgiving; but they were real, genuine, and substantial testimonys or expressions of the gratitude of the offerers. Wherefore, since the bullocks which were offered as sacrifices of thanksgiving, were intended to be proper testimonys or expressions of the gratitude of the offerers; and since it is a thing so common and familiar in scripture, and in all other writings, to express one thing by the name of another thing, which has something in it that is similar; is it not natural to think, that this may be all that is done in the text before us; and that the praises or thanksgivings of the lips, which are expressions of the inward gratitude of the heart, are called *the bullocks of the lips*, in allusion to those bullocks which were offered as sacrifices of thanksgiving, which were also expressions of the

the

the gratitude of the heart? this interpretation is so far from being improbable, that it seems to be very natural.—And if it should happen to prove the true one, it implies an allusion to sacrifices of thanksgiving, not as symbols of thanksgiving, or praise, but as having something in their design and use, that was similar to them.—After all; I can see no reason or necessity for having recourse to allusion of any kind, for the interpretation of this phrase, since the words, understood according to their obvious, literal signification, will afford a very good sense, by the help of a very common and familiar ellipsis only. In other passages of scripture, we find, that *the words of the lips, the pleading of the lips, the commandment of the lips, and the request of the lips*, signify the words, the pleading, the commandment, and request, which are uttered or pronounced by the lips. (See Job xiii. 6.—xxiii. 12. Psal. xvii. 4.—xxi. 2.—l. 12.) And if we should supply the ellipsis in the same manner here, and, by *bullocks of the lips*, understand these bullocks which had been uttered, vowed, or promised to God, by the lips; then the sense of the expression, *we will offer up the bullocks of our lips*, will be the same with that which we have expressed, Psalm lxvi. 13—15. *I will pay thee my vows which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble;*

I will offer unto thee burnt-sacrifice of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks and goats.—This interpretation is perfectly suitable to the scope and design of the discourse, easy and natural, and withal, simple and literal, which cannot be said of any other; for which reason, I take it to be the best interpretation of this passage. But whether this, or the foregoing, be admitted for the true interpretation, the expression is really capable of both. And, therefore, there can be no reason for admitting the Dr's interpretation of it, which is so highly figurative, and scarce consistent with common sense.

§. 4. THE other texts in this paragraph of the Dr's book are the following, viz. Psalm iv. 5. *Offer unto God the sacrifices of righteousness.* Psalm l. 14. *Sacrifice unto God thanksgiving,* ver. 23. *Whoso sacrificeth praise, glorifieth me.* Psalm li. 17. *The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.* 1 Pet. ii. 5. *Ye are an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable unto God.* Heb. xiii. 15. *By him let us offer up the sacrifices of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name.* These texts I am now to examine conjunctly, and to consider what evidence they afford of the truth of the Dr's notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 15. IN some of these texts, righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and praise, are called sacrifices; and, in others of them, they who exercised or practised these, are said to sacrifice them, which implies that they were sacrifices. And in these modes of expression must that inference, which the *Dr.* would draw in support of his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, have it's sole and whole foundation. Now in order to discover whether these modes of expression are favourable, or not favourable, to this notion of his, I shall lay the following critical remarks or observations before the reader.

§. 16. THESE modes of expression cannot be supposed to intimate, that righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, praise, and sacrifice, are equipollent terms, or words of the same signification: for if we should suppose this, the sense of the text would be low and trifling, as any person, who will be at the pains of making the experiment, will readily perceive. Withal, the sense assigned to the expressions, would be false as well as trifling: for, upon all schemes, even upon the *Dr's*, the term sacrifice really doth, and must, stand for an idea different from those of righteousness, a broken heart, prayer, or praise. The *Dr's* very definitions of sacrifices furnish us with an idea of them, that is quite different from those here men-

D

tioned,

tioned. And; therefore, 'tis to be hoped, that for his own sake, he will no longer insist, that the terms, righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, praise, and sacrifice, are to be understood as equipollent or synonymous, either in the texts under consideration, or in any others.

§. 17. WHEREFORE, since the equipollent sense cannot be admitted in the interpretation of these texts; let us next see whether the symbolical sense can.—This is the sense which is exhibited in the *Dr's* definitions of sacrifice. And, therefore, if the terms sacrifice and sacrificing can be rationally thought to bear this sense in the texts mentioned, these texts will be to the *Dr's* purpose, as being proofs of this, that “ sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God; expressing by emblematical actions, what is expressed in prayer and praise by words, or in the course of life by deeds.” This, therefore, must be carefully examined.

§. 18. For this end, I observe, that the symbol of a thing is often called, or said to be the thing of which it is the symbol. Thus we say of the picture or statue of any particular person, this is such a person; and of the map of any particular country, this is such a country. There is nothing more common and familiar in all languages than such expressions as these,
and

and they are perfectly well understood by every body. These modes of expression are of the elliptical kind; and the ellipsis is thus supplied, this picture or statue is the picture or statue of such a person; this map is the map or representation of such a country. Wherefore, if sacrifices were symbols of righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and praise; their being called righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, or praise, would be agreeable to a mode of expression, which is common and familiar in all languages. But before this way of interpreting these expressions, in the texts under consideration, or in any other writing, can, in reason, be admitted, it must be first proved, that sacrifices were symbols of righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and praise; for till this is done, the interpretation will be only imaginary. And, therefore, before the *Dr.* can reasonably claim the privilege of interpreting the expressions in these texts, after this manner, he must not take it for granted, but prove, that sacrifices were symbols of righteousness, a broken heart, prayer and praise, otherwise his interpretation will be only conjectural, and consequently, of no use to him.

§. 19. BUT what seems to me to be most unfavourable to the *Dr.*'s interpretation, is, that, in these texts, sacrifices are not called righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and

praise : but righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and praise, are said to be sacrifices : that is, supposing sacrifices to be symbols ; and righteousness, a broken spirit, prayer, and praise, to be the things which are represented by them ; it is not said, that the symbols are the things represented by them, but that the things represented are the symbols which are representative of them. Now this is evidently false and absurd ; and, therefore, a mode of expression, that has never been in use among any people, however rude or barbarous. For though there is nothing more common, than to hear a picture, or statue, called a man or a woman ; or a map, a country ; or a horn, (the emblem of plenty) plenty ; yet we never hear a man, or a woman, called a picture or statue ; or a country, a map ; or plenty, a horn, because the latter are symbols or emblems of the former. This observation clearly shews us, that the *Dr's* interpretation of the texts under consideration, or rather, the interpretation which his notion of sacrifices requires to be given to them, in order to render them proofs of it, is inconsistent both with truth, and with any of these ways of speaking about symbols, which have obtained among men.

§. 20. IF it be needful to say any thing further, to shew the falshood of that interpretation of these texts, which is necessary
to

Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 37

to render them subservient to the *Dr's* purpose; let us try the following method. In place of the word sacrifice, let us substitute the symbol of the thing which is supposed to be represented by it; and in place of the term sacrificing, the symbolical action which is said to be denoted by it; and see how the sense will turn out. When these substitutions are made, the texts will run thus.

Psal. iv. 5. *Offer unto God the symbols of righteousness.*

Psal. l. 14. *Offer unto God the symbol of thanksgiving.*

ver. 23. *Who so offereth the symbol of praise, glorifieth me.*

Psal. li. 17. *The symbols of a broken spirit, which God requireth, and will accept of, are a broken spirit.*

1 Pet. ii. 5. *Ye are an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual symbols of address, acceptable to God.*

Heb. xiii. 15. *By him let us offer up the symbols of praise to God continually, &c.*

In two of these renderings, the sense is absurd; in them all, it is low and trifling: and, therefore, it cannot be thought to be the true and right sense of them. Wherefore, since the *Dr's* end and design in quoting these texts, requires a sense to be given to them, which is either absurd, or jejune and frivolous, it cannot be supposed, that

that is the true sense of them, or that they can, in any respect, subserve his purpose.

§. 21. THE rhetorical figure, which is used in these texts, seems to me, to be either an allusion to sacrifices, not as symbols of prayer, praise, &c. but only as having something that was similar to them, in their efficacy, effects, or manner of oblation; or to be a metonymie of the effect for the cause.

§. 22. WHERE there happens to be a remarkable similitude or resemblance between two things in some quality or circumstance, the one of them is frequently called by the name of the other, on account of that similitude only. And in this way of allusion to similitude, and not to symbol, may prayer, praise, &c. be called sacrifices. Sacrifices were oblations that were offered to God: and when they were offered, with the prescribed dispositions of mind, they were acceptable to him, and available to obtain blessings from him. In like manner, penitent disposition, righteousness, prayer, and praise, exercised and performed in obedience to the will of God, are oblations tendered to him by the mind, acceptable to him, and available to obtain from him the same blessings as sacrifices, but in a different way. Wherefore, there being such an evident resemblance between the oblation, efficacy, and effect of these, and those of sacrifices, they may, on that account, be called
sacri-

sacrifices ; and they really are so called in an elegant and emphatic manner, and that without any regard to sacrifices as symbols or emblems of them. The texts, therefore, before us, in which these modes of expression occur, may be thus understood, without any straining; and when they are so understood, they afford a sense which is both good and elegant: whereas, if they are understood in the *Dr's* way, as carrying references to sacrifices, as symbols of prayer, praise, &c. the sense is either absurd, or low and frivolous, as we have already seen.

§. 23. PERHAPS the sense of these texts may be more striking and affecting, if we consider the rhetorical figure, used in them, to be a metonymie of the effect for the cause, or of the thing accepted for the ground of acceptance ; a rhetorical figure which frequently occurs in holy scripture.—The acceptance and whole efficacy of sacrifice did depend on the penitent disposition, righteousness, and the sincere prayers and praises of the offerers. And may not a broken spirit, righteousness, prayer, and praise be, on this account, called sacrifices ; and they who practised them, be said, to sacrifice them ? In this case, the thing accepted will be put for the ground of acceptance ; and that on which the whole worth of sacrifice depended, will be called sacrifice. The texts before us, thus understood, will have a

sense not only good, but highly elegant and emphatic; and the phraseology in them will be very sublime and poetical: and the thing inculcated will be this, that the acceptance of sacrifice did entirely depend on a virtuous temper and behaviour; that, without these, the most pompous and expensive sacrifices were worthless and unprofitable; that, therefore, the tendering to God a good heart, and a pious and virtuous life, ought to be considered and regarded as the best and most excellent oblation that can be made to him.—To conclude, if we understand what is said in these texts, either in the figurative sense now mentioned, or in that which is expressed in the foregoing paragraph, they will have a sense that is good, elegant, and emphatic.

§. 24. BEFORE I leave these texts, it may not be altogether foreign to my design in this performance, to observe, that the *Dr.* before he can adapt them to his purpose, and make them subservient to it, has two things to prove; (1.) That these texts will have a consistent, good, and probable sense, when the terms sacrifice and sacrificing, which occur in them, are understood as having a reference to sacrifices, as symbols or emblems of address to God. And, (2.) That these terms cannot be understood in a lower, or in any other, figurative sense, than his. For if he could prove the former,

mer,

Part I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 41

mer, but cannot prove the latter, his notion of the symbolical nature of sacrifices, will have no support from these texts, but what is imaginary and conjectural. And every body knows that fancy and conjecture are no proof of any thing.—I now go on with the *Dr.*

Scripture-evidence produced by Dr. Taylor,
continued.

§. 25. “ MOREOVER, expences, labours,
“ pains, sufferings for God, kindness to the
“ poor, are by the sacred writers figuratively
“ called sacrifices, pleasing and acceptable
“ to God. Which plainly shews, they understood proper sacrifices were acceptable
“ to him in the same manner, viz. as attended with a pious and well-disposed
“ mind. Phil. iv. 18. *Having received the things which you sent, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice well-pleasing to God.*
“ Heb. xiii. 16. *But to do good and communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well-pleased.* A pure and chaste
“ body is also called a sacrifice, Rom. xii. 1. *Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God.* The conversion of
“ the Gentiles is also considered as a sacrifice, Rom. xv. 16. *That I Paul should be the minister, or priest, of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up, or sacrificing, of the*
Gentiles

“ *Gentiles might be acceptable to God, &c.*
 “ Hence it appears, that Jewish offerings
 “ and sacrifices had a respect to self-dedica-
 “ tion; otherwise the apostle could not
 “ have used them to signify his present-
 “ ing the Gentiles to God. See Isaiah
 “ lxvi. 20. *Thou shalt bring all your brethren*
 “ *for an offering unto the Lord.*” (If, by
 self-dedication, the *Dr.* means the solemn
 dedication either of single persons, or of
 bodies of people, to God; he might have
 said, not only that Jewish sacrifices had re-
 spect to self-dedication, but that they were
 the very rites made use of on such occasions,
 and the principal external means by which
 self-dedication was performed; and he would
 have said nothing but truth; though I can-
 not say, that this would have made any
 thing for his main purpose.) “ Blood spilt
 “ in God’s service is also called sacrifice,
 “ Phil. ii. 17. *Yea, and if I be offered upon*
 “ *the sacrifice and service of your faith.*
 “ Where, likewise, the service of faith,
 “ or faithful service, comes under the same
 “ notion. Agreeably to this, the souls of
 “ them, who were slain for the word of
 “ God, are represented to be under the altar,
 “ Rev. vi. 9, 10. the very place where the
 “ blood or soul of the sacrifice was poured
 “ out, Lev. iv. 7, 18, 25, 30^d.”

^d See Script. doc. of aton. Chap. II. § 22.

E X A M I N A T I O N.

§. 26. IN this paragraph of the *Dr's* book, we have an enumeration of several other things which, in scripture, are called sacrifices, such as, expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, kindness to the poor. This fact is so well supported by the *Dr's* vouchers, that it cannot be denied. For my own part, I am fully satisfied of the truth of it — Well, since the truth of this fact is acknowledged, must not the inference, which the *Dr.* would draw from it, (*viz.* that sacrifices were symbols of expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, and kindness to the poor,) be admitted likewise? I think, this inference ought not to be admitted, for this plain reason, because the things mentioned, might rather have been called sacrifices on another account, than because sacrifices were symbols or emblems of them. The oblation of sacrifices was an expensive and burthensome service: and when it was performed with the proper and requisite dispositions of mind, it was a service that was pleasing and acceptable to God. Between sacrifices, therefore, considered in both these views, and expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, and kindness to the poor, there was a remarkable similitude or resemblance. Both of them were expensive and burthensome

some services : both of them were pleasing and acceptable to God, when performed in obedience to his will, and with right and proper dispositions of mind. Why then might not expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, and kindness to the poor, be called sacrifices, on account of this similitude between them, and on no other account? the similitude, for certain, is very obvious; and, at the same time, natural, elegant and striking. What reason, or occasion, then, can there be for having recourse, for the sense of these figurative expressions, to a rhetorical figure so high and lofty, as that of allusion to symbol, when the lower and more common one of allusion to a similitude in the thing, is sufficient to give them a good sense, yea and even an elegant one? especially, when it is considered, that this very similitude, upon which the allusion is grounded, is plainly implied in all the texts referred to by the *Dr.* and is clearly expressed in some of them. Now the very possibility of giving a good and elegant sense to these expressions, without offering any violence to them, or having recourse to any symbolical notion of sacrifice, plainly shews us, that the *Dr.* can never prove that his interpretation of the sense of them, by the help of such a notion of sacrifice, is the true and right one; consequently, that he can bring no good argument,

ment, from these expressions, in support of his notion of the symbolical nature of sacrifices.—But what puts it beyond all doubt with me, that the *Dr's* interpretation of these figurative expressions is a wrong one, is, that it is chargeable with the same objections, or rather demonstrations of falshood, which are mentioned and set forth in my examination of the texts in the foregoing article; as giving a sense to these expressions, which is either absurd, or low and trifling; and as adopting a way of speaking, about such things as are represented by symbols, as is false in itself, and not found to be used in any language.

§. 27. THE *Dr.* indeed, doth not draw any express inference from these figurative expressions in support of his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices. However, when the end, for which he produces them, is considered, one cannot help thinking, that he meant to say something, that might induce his reader to conceive, that they gave some ground for thinking that Jewish sacrifices were of a symbolical nature; for unless he meant this, to what purpose doth he mention them at all? well, what is it that the *Dr.* doth say? truly nothing that is a sufficient ground for the inference which he would have us to draw from these figurative expressions. He says,
 “Expences, labours, pains, sufferings for
 “ God,

46 *Dr. TAYLOR's Sentiments of* Part I.

“ God, and kindness to the poor, are figuratively called sacrifices, pleasing and acceptable to God ;” and that they are so called, as being attended with “ a pious and well-disposed mind.” He says, likewise, “ Proper sacrifices were understood to be pleasing and acceptable to God in the same manner, *viz.* as being attended with a pious and well-disposed mind.” These are the *Dr's* premises, and his only premises. And I know of no conclusions that can be rightly drawn from them, relating to the case in hand, but the two following, *viz.* 1st. That expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, kindness to the poor, and, likewise, Jewish sacrifices, were all pleasing and acceptable to God, only as they were attended with a pious and well-disposed mind. 2dly. That because expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, kindness to the poor, are acceptable and pleasing to God on the same account that Jewish sacrifices were pleasing and acceptable to him, the former are, for this particular reason, called sacrifices. Now, as to the *first* of these two conclusions, every body, I think, must see, that it makes nothing for the *Dr's* purpose. And as to the *second*, it is directly against him ; because it makes the sameness of the ground of acceptance, to be the reason why expences, labours, pains, sufferings for God, and
kind-

Chap. I. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 47

kindness to the poor, are figuratively called sacrifices; and so leaves neither room nor reason for thinking that they are so called, because sacrifices were symbols of them. In order to draw any such conclusion as the last mentioned, from the *Dr's* premises, an uncommon stretch of sophistry will be necessary: and till it is both drawn, and shewn to follow, from them, the texts here quoted by the *Dr.* will be of no manner of service to him in this affair. But to proceed.

*Scripture-evidence produced by Dr. Taylor,
continued.*

§. 28. THE *Dr.* says, “ This leads us to conceive, that probably the pouring out
“ the blood of every sacrifice *at the bottom*
“ *of the altar*, denoted the readiness and
“ resolution, or, however, the duty of the
“ person who offered the sacrifice, to lay
“ down his life in adherence to God.
“ And whereas our Lord, who was both
“ sacrifice and sacrificer, (Heb. ix. 14.
“ Eph. v. 2. *He gave, or offered himself a*
“ *sacrifice to God,*) is stiled *a lamb without*
“ *spot and blemish*, to denote his perfect
“ purity and holiness; this suggests, that
“ the sacrifices being *without spot and blemish*
“ denotes, that the sacrificer ought to per-
“ form the service, or to lead his whole
“ life,

“ life, with the utmost sincerity and fanc-
 “ tity of heart. Other ritual actions, as
 “ *washing the inwards and feet, &c.* I doubt
 “ not, had their spiritual meaning; which
 “ would not be difficult to be understood
 “ by a people that were so much versed
 “ in moral figures and emblems. But as
 “ I am confined to scripture-evidence, I
 “ must insist upon nothing but what is
 “ there particularly explained. And what
 “ we have found there, is sufficient to my
 “ present purpose *.”

EXAMINATION.

§. 29. In the conclusion of the foregoing paragraph, the *Dr.* says, “ The souls
 “ of them who were slain for the word
 “ of God, are represented to be under the
 “ altar, Rev. vi. 9, 10. the very place
 “ where the blood, or soul of the sacrifice was
 “ poured out, Lev. iv. 7, 18, 25, 30.” To
 which he subjoins in the beginning of this
 paragraph, “ This leads us to conceive,
 “ that probably the pouring out the blood
 “ of every sacrifice *at the bottom of the*
 “ *altar*, denoted the readiness and resolu-
 “ tion, or, however, the duty of the per-
 “ son who offered the sacrifice, to lay down
 “ his life in adherence to God.”—The

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
 Chap. II. §. 23.

following observations will shew the weakness of this reasoning.

§. 30. THE blood of all sacrifices was ordered to be poured out *at the bottom of the altar*; and no other blood was poured out there. When, therefore, any blood was seen at the *bottom of the altar*, it was natural, and even necessary, to conclude, that that blood was the blood of such animals as had been slain, and lost their lives, on a religious account. Wherefore, when St. John saw, in a vision, the souls, or blood, of men, under the altar in heaven; this representation gave him ground to conclude, that the blood, which he saw, was the blood, or souls, of martyrs, or of such persons as had been slain for the word of God, or on a religious account. The representation itself was a sufficient ground for this conclusion. But I cannot conceive, what could give any ground to the *Dr.* for imagining, that this visionary representation, or the conclusion which St. John might have drawn from it, should “lead us to conceive, that probably the pouring out the blood of every sacrifice *at the bottom of the altar*, denoted the readiness and resolution, or, however, the duty, of the person who offered the sacrifice, to lay down his life in adherence to God.”—The souls, or blood, of the martyrs, under the altar in heaven, was a lively representation

tation of what they had already done ; of the resolution, and courage, and readiness with which they had acted on earth, in laying down their lives in adherence to God ; and not, as the *Dr's* way of reasoning intimates, of the resolution and readiness with which they were to act, or obliged to act, for the future, in laying down their lives again in adherence to God. As far, therefore, as I can see, the only conclusion, relating, to the meaning of the rite of pouring out the blood of the Jewish sacrifices *at the bottom of the altar*, that can be drawn from this visionary representation, is, that the blood there poured out, was the blood of such animals as had been slain and offered in sacrifice, or lost their lives on a religious account. Upon the whole, it appears, that the *Dr's* opinion about the meaning of that rite is a mere fancy of his own, destitute of all support from that passage in the Revelation of St. John, upon which he grounds it.

§. 31. THE *Dr.* subjoins, “ And whereas
 “ our Lord, who was himself both a sa-
 “ crifice, and sacrificer, (*He gave, or offered*
 “ *himself a sacrifice to God*, Eph. v. 2.
 “ Heb. ix. 14.) is stiled a *lamb without*
 “ *spot and blemish*, to denote his perfect
 “ purity and holiness ; this suggests, that
 “ the sacrifices being without spot or ble-
 “ mish, denotes that the sacrificer ought
 “ to

“ to perform the service or to lead his
 “ whole life, with the utmost sincerity and
 “ sanctity of heart.”—Here I heartily wish,
 that the *Dr.* for the help and assistance
 of such a weak mind as mine, had re-
 duced his reasoning, in these words, to
 the form of a syllogism. For my part,
 I have viewed, and reviewed them, over
 and over again, with all the care and at-
 tention I am master of; and yet can find
 no premises in them, that will either sup-
 ply or support such a conclusion as the *Dr.*
 says they suggest. The only syllogism that
 I can make out of them, is the following,
 which is a very bad one.

The sacrifice, which Christ offered of
 himself, is called *a lamb without spot and
 blemish*. The lambs, offered in sacrifice,
 under the Mosaic law, were, likewise,
lambs without spot and blemish. So that,
 in both cases, *lambs without spot and
 blemish* were offered in sacrifice.

But the sacrifice, which Christ offered
 of himself, was called *a lamb without spot
 and blemish* not literally, but only figura-
 tively, to denote his perfect purity and
 holiness.

THEREFORE, the lambs, which were
 offered in sacrifice, under the Mosaic
 law, must be understood to be *lambs
 without spot and blemish*, not in a literal,

but in a figurative sense, as denoting (not the perfect purity and holiness of these animals, as in the other case, but) that the sacrificer was to perform the service, or to lead his whole life with the utmost sincerity and sanctity of heart.

THIS is the only syllogism which I can make out of the *Dr's* words. And it is a mere sophism. For, 1st. In the first proposition, the middle term (*viz. lambs without spot and blemish*) is used in a double sense, *viz.* for moral excellence, and for natural perfection of body. But in the second proposition, it is used in one of these senses only, *viz.* for moral excellence. By this means, there come to be two middle terms in the syllogism; which quite spoils the reasoning.—But, 2dly. Supposing there was no fault in the syllogism, with regard to the middle term, the conclusion is wrong drawn: for the only conclusion that would, in this case, follow from the premises, (as every body must see,) is this, that the lambs, which were offered in sacrifice, under the law of Moses, must be understood to be *Lambs without spot and blemish*, not in a literal, but in a figurative sense, as denoting that these animals ought to be perfectly pure and holy: whereas, the conclusion, which the *Dr's* way of reasoning requires to be drawn from them, is, that these lambs
were

were so denominated, to denote, "That
" the sacrificer ought to perform the ser-
" vice, or to lead his whole life, with the
" utmost sincerity and sanctity of heart:"
a conclusion, which, every body must see,
doth not follow from them.

§. 32. THE *Dr.* goes on; "Other ritual
" actions, as *washing the inwards and feet,*
" &c. I doubt not, had their spiritual mean-
" ing; which would not be difficult to
" be understood by a people that were so
" much versed in moral figures and em-
" blems."—To which I answer. The
Jews, without doubt, were a people who, in
process of time, came to be exceedingly
versed in moral figures and emblems; for
they made such improvements in this no-
ble science, that at last, they converted the
most part of their sacred writings into figure,
emblem, and allegory. But I suppose the
Dr. has not so high or favourable an opinion
of their wisdom and skill in this surprising
and admirable art, or of the truth and use-
fulness of their cabalistical jargon about mo-
ral figures and emblems, as to recommend
them, and their great judgment in things
of this kind, to the regards of mankind.—
How far this people were versed in moral
figures and emblems in the days of Mo-
ses; or by what means they might be ena-
bled to discover figures and emblems in
their law, or the meaning of them, any

farther than that law gave them instructions about them; or by what helps either they, or the *Dr.* himself, could find out, that “the *washing the inwards and feet*, and “other ritual actions of the like nature, “had a spiritual or figurative meaning;” these are things of which I am entirely ignorant; and, therefore, shall determine nothing, one way or other, about them. However, I cannot but congratulate the *Dr.* here, in that he has got above doubt, in an affair which was not difficult to be understood by the Jews; though I, and the bulk of mankind, have not yet found out the means of getting above doubt, or even of knowing any thing at all, about it. And, if no inconveniency may attend the communication of this secret, I could wish that the *Dr.* would be so good as to publish it.—But, after all, the *Dr.* tells us, “that he is confined to scripture-evidence; “and must insist upon nothing, but what “is there particularly explained.” A plain confession this, that he had no scripture-evidence, whereby he could clear up the spiritual meaning of these ritual actions; and, consequently, that the mentioning of them, was nothing to his purpose.

The general conclusion drawn from the foregoing evidence.

§. 33. BUT then the *Dr.* adds, what he thought was greatly to his purpose, *viz.* “What (evidence) we have found there (in the scriptures) is sufficient to the present purpose. For laying all this together, it can, I think, be no question, but sacrifices were a symbolical address to God; intended to express before him the devotion, affections, dispositions, and desires of the heart, by significative and emblematical actions ^f.”

A N S W E R.

§. 34. ALL that I think needful to be said, in answer to this general conclusion, is, that every text of scripture, produced by the *Dr.* in support of this notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, has been particularly considered; and, upon the strictest scrutiny, it has been found, that none of these texts contain any truths, or supply any consequences, which give any manner of countenance to this notion of sacrifices. Wherefore, I conclude, that when all these texts, and all the truths

^f See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. II. §. 23, 24.

really contained in them, and all the consequences fairly deducible from them, are laid together, they do not amount to any scripture-evidence, or any degree of scripture-evidence, of the truth of the *Dr's* notion of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 35. IN the two following paragraphs, the *Dr.* tells us, That, in this notion of sacrifice, which he gives us, is included " whatsoever is expressive of a pious and virtuous disposition^{*}," &c. And that what is said of the worshipper, as having "*made a covenant with God by sacrifice*, Psalm l. 5." may be well explained by it.—To which I answer; that it is not my business here, to consider what is included, or not included, in the *Dr's* notion of sacrifice; or what may be done, or not done, by the help of it; but to enquire, whether the scripture-evidence, which he has produced, be sufficient to support and prove the truth of it. The scripture-evidence, which the *Dr.* has yet produced, is lame and inconclusive, as I have shewn. When he has produced better, it may then be proper to consider what is included in his notion of sacrifice, or may be done by the help of it.

§. 36. THE *Dr.* having thus given us his notion of Jewish sacrifices, and confirmed,

^{*} See Scrip. doc. of Aton. Chap. II. §. 25, 26.

as he thinks, the truth of it by scripture-evidence, he now proceeds to erect his scheme upon it, by accounting, in a rational way, for the effect which those sacrifices had, in reference (1.) To God; and (2) To the persons who offered them.

§. 37. 1st. As to the effect, which those sacrifices had with God, he says, " Thus (*i. e.* by conceiving of sacrifices as symbolical addresses to God, by emblematical actions) " we may form an idea of the effect which sacrifices had with God; " which cannot well be any other than " that of prayer and praise, or other expressions of our religious regards; which " are pleasing to God as they proceed from, " or produce, good affections in us ^b."

§. 38. ANSW. Prayer and praise, without doubt, are acceptable to God, as they proceed from, or produce, good affections in us. But before it can be, in reason, admitted, that Jewish sacrifices had their effect with God after the same manner as prayer and praise, it must be first proved, that those sacrifices were not only symbols of, but of the same nature and property with, prayer and praise; or, which is the same thing, that sacrifice, prayer, and praise, are equipollent terms. Both these propo-

^b See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. II. §. 27.

sitions,

fitions, however inconsistent, the *Dr.* indeed, has endeavoured to prove and support by scripture-evidence. But the scripture-evidence, which he has advanced for these purposes, when examined by the rules of just and sober criticism, has been found to be defective, and, indeed, no scripture-evidence at all. And, therefore, real and true scripture-evidence is still wanting, and called for.

§. 39. 2dly. As to the effect which Jewish sacrifices had, in reference to the persons who offered them, the *Dr.* says, "They were effectual to obtain the blessings desired. Particularly, sin-offerings, or piacular sacrifices,—were available to the forgiveness of sin. For it is often repeated in Levit. iv. v, and vi. chapters, *And the priest shall make atonement for him, or them, or for the sin, and it shall be forgiven.*—Now taking sacrifice for a penitent address to God, this may be accounted for in the same manner as all other declarations of forgiveness to those who repent, &c.¹"

§. 40. ANSW. That sacrifices were, some way or other, the means of obtaining blessings for the offerers, or of the conveyance of blessings to them; and that piacular sacrifices, in particular, were the

¹ See Scrip. doc. of Aton. ex. Chap. II, § 28.

means

means of the conveyance of the pardon of sin to them; these are things which no person, who believes the truth of the holy scriptures, can have any doubt about.— But whether piacular sacrifices were a penitent address to God, and whether the efficacy of these sacrifices, as availing to the pardon of sin, be to be accounted for after the same manner as that of penitent address; these are things which stand in need of some good proof. —Supposing it really were true, that piacular sacrifice was a penitent address to God, yet this is not a self-evident proposition; and, therefore, it ought to be proved, before it be admitted for a true one. And, I add, that other and better evidences must be brought of its truth, than those texts of scripture, from which the *Dr.* would infer, that sacrifice and prayer are equipollent terms; because there is nothing in those texts that amounts to a proof, or even any shadow of a proof, of it, as I have shewn already. But there is no need to insist any farther upon this point, because the *Dr.* himself, if he will stand to his own definitions of sacrifice, must disclaim this notion of sacrifice: for, in his own sense of things, expressed in those definitions, sacrifice is not penitent address, but only a symbol of penitent address. And it will be allowed,

I think, that there is a wide difference between a thing and the symbol of it. Now if we should suppose with the *Dr.* that particular sacrifice was a symbol of penitent address, yet it will be no easy matter to prove, that the efficacy of sacrifice and that of penitent address are the same, or that they may be accounted for after the same manner: for in order to prove this, it will be necessary to prove, that penitent address and the external symbol of it have the same efficacy: and, therefore, it will be incumbent on the *Dr.* to produce a clear and satisfactory proof of this; and in doing this, if I am not mistaken, he will find great difficulty.—To say here, that particular sacrifices, as symbols of penitent address to God, availed to the obtaining of the pardon of sin, is saying nothing to the purpose. It is the same way of reasoning as if, to prove that the shell of a nut is nourishing to the body, one should say, the shell of a nut, as containing the kernel, is conducive to the nourishment of the body; and, therefore the efficacy of the shell and of the kernel of a nut in nourishing the body, may be accounted for after the same manner. The moral virtues of the mind have been represented by external symbols. But can any person think, that those symbols, however used, or to
what

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 61

what person soever tendered, would have the same efficacy as the moral virtues themselves; or that the efficacy of the moral virtues, and of the symbols of them, is to be accounted for, after the same manner?

Having now examined all the evidence for the symbolical nature and efficacy of Jewish sacrifices, the *Dr.* has brought from the way and manner in which the scriptures speak of *Sacrifice* and *Sacrificing*, in those passages which have no relation to Jewish Sacrifices, I now proceed to

C H A P. II.

Containing an examination of that proof of the symbolical meaning, efficacy, and design of Jewish sacrifices, which Dr. Taylor brings from those accounts which the scriptures give us of atonements that were made by other means than Levitical sacrifices.

§. 1. **D**R. Taylor having observed, “ that
“ words of seven significations
“ are derived from the Hebrew root כפר
“ *capbar*; of which significations, atone-
“ ment, or to make atonement, is one ^a.”
and taken notice, likewise, “ that the word,
“ atonement, in our English translation of

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. IV. §. 62.

“ the

“ the Old Testament, is always rendered
 “ from some tense, or noun, derived from
 “ this Hebrew root ^b ;” he next sets down
 all the places in the Old Testament where
 this Hebrew word occurs, in the sense of
 atonement, either as a verb, or a noun.
 And in doing this, he marks all these
 places with an asterism, where it occurs
 in an extra-levitical sense, or as having no
 relation to Jewish sacrifices. The places
 thus marked, are the following, *viz.* (1.) As
 a verb, Exod. xxi. 30.—xxix. 10, 15.—
 xxxii. 30. Numb. xvi. 46, 47.—xxv. 13.—
 xxxi. 50. 2 Sam. xxi. 3. Deut. xxi. 8.—
 xxxii. 43. Numb. xxxv. 33. Psal. lxxv. 2.—
 lxxix. 9. Prov. xvi. 6. Isai. vi. 7.—xxii. 14.
 —xxvii. 9. Dan. ix. 24. Gen. xxxii. 20.
 Prov. xvi. 14. Ezek. xvi. 63. Isai. xlvii. 11.
 Deut. xxi. 8. 2 Chron. xxx. 18. Psal. lxxviii.
 38. Jer. xviii. 23. Isai. xxviii. 18. (2.) As
 a noun, Exod. xxx. 12. Job xxxiii. 24.—
 xxxvi. 18. Prov. vi. 35.—xiii. 8.—xxi. 18.
 Isai. xliii. 3. Psal. xlix. 7. Numb. xxxv.
 31, 32. 1 Sam. xii. 3. Amos v. 12 ^c.

§. 2. IN order to discover the true sense
 of atonement, and of making atonement,
 in each of these texts, the *Dr.* sets them
 all down, one after another, in one co-
 lumn; and, opposite to each of them, (in

^b See Scrip. doc. of Aton. ex. Chap. IV. §. 61.

^c Ibidem §. 66, 67.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 63

another column,) he marks down the *mean* by which the atonement was made, and the *effect* which was produced by it. *e. g.*

Amos v. 12.—They afflict
the just, they take a bribe
כֶּפֶן [an atonement]

EFFECT. Exemption of the
guilty from punishment
MEAN. A premium given. ^d

§. 3. INSTEAD of sitting down each of the texts afore said, together with the *effect* and *mean* of atonement, after this manner; I shall give the reader a view of the several effects which are ascribed to extra-levitical atonements in these texts, and of the several means by which they were produced; this being all that is necessary to my purpose.

§. 4. THE effects which are ascribed to extra-levitical atonements in these texts, are the following, *viz.*

1st. The prevention of, or deliverance from, certain natural evils; particularly dangers, sufferings, calamitys, the wrath of man, the power and oppression of enemies, distemper of body, death, the restoration of safety and prosperity.

2dly. The prevention of, or deliverance from, penal evils, or such natural evils as had been threatened or inflicted as the punishment of sin; particularly, sufferings, ca-

^d See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. V.

lamitys,

lamitys, judgments, destruction, the plague, enemies, captivity, sickness, death.

3dly, Satisfaction to the injured Gibeonites, which was effected by an act of justice on bloody Saul's family.

§. 5. THE means, by which the foregoing effects are said to be produced in the texts afore said, are the following, *viz.* Half a shekel of money; a censer of burning incense in the hand of Aaron; the execution of justice on criminals; an offering out of the spoils; the slaying of an heifer, protestation of innocence, and prayer; the mercy or pure goodness of God; mercy and truth; benevolence and justice practised towards men; prayer; wise and prudent counsel; a handsome present; a sum of money payed; a premium, or bribe; affliction and correction, productive of repentance and reformation; such sufferings of wicked men as were conducive to the happiness and deliverance of the righteous.

§. 6. THESE then are all the *effects* which, in the texts before-mentioned, are ascribed to extra-levitical atonements; and these the several *means* by which those effects were produced. Hence it is evident, that an extra-levitical atonement did consist in the production of one or other of these effects, by some one other of the means mentioned. This gives us a clear idea of the nature of extra-levitical atonements.

§. 7. Now,

§. 7. Now, if the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical meaning and design of Jewish sacrifices, can be rightly inferred from this representation which he has given us of the nature of extra-levitical atonements, as being certain effects produced by various sorts of means ; it must be inferred either from every part of it, or from a certain part of it only. The *Dr.* himself doth not pretend to infer it from every part of this representation. And, indeed, in many parts of it, there is such a dissimilarity between the means and effects, and those of Levitical atonements, that nothing can be inferred from them concerning the nature and design of Jewish sacrifices. It remains, therefore, that the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical meaning and design of Jewish sacrifices, can only, even in his own apprehension of things, be inferred from some part of the representation which he has given us of the nature of extra-levitical atonements ; and particularly from that part of it, where there appears to be some similarity between the means and effects used and produced in the one case, and those which were used and produced in the other. And in order to discover this part of it, it will be necessary to attend to that arrangement or assortment of the foregoing texts, which the *Dr.* exhibits in the VIth chapter of his book.

§. 8. IN sorting these texts, the *Dr.* observes, first, that, “in some cases, persons “make atonement for themselves:”—And, “in other cases, atonement is made for “them by others.”—These observations relate only to the persons by whom, and for whom, atonement was made, but determine nothing about the nature of atonement. For which reason, I shall say nothing more about them.

§. 9. His next observation, is, that, “one of these texts (*viz.* Dan. ix. 24.) “relateth to the Messiah.”—This text affords no ground to think, that the Jewish sacrifices were of a symbolical nature, because the atonement, made by the sacrifice of the Messiah, was not of that kind.

§. 10. His third observation, is, that “one place (*Isai.* xxv. 18.) relates to the “disannulling of an agreement.”—This agreement was a covenant made with death. And punishment was the mean by which it was to be disannulled. Wherefore, no conclusion can be drawn from the nature of this extra-levitical atonement concerning the symbolical nature of Levitical atonements; because the effect produced, and the mean

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 107. N^o. 1.

† Ibidem N^o. 2.

‡ Ibidem N^o. 3.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 67

made use of, in the one case, were quite different from those in the other.

§. 11. HE next observes, that "Six (of the cases in these texts) relate to the "dealings of one man with another," (*viz.* Gen. xxii. 40. Prov. xvi. 14.—vi. 35.—xiii. 8.—1 Sam. xii. 3. Amos v. 12.) In these cases, he says, "one person is supposed to "be obnoxious to the resentment of another: and the atonement or ransom is "made by giving, doing, or saying something to content, appease, and reconcile "the offended party^h."—'Tis manifest, therefore, that the means by which these atonements were made, were not of a symbolical nature, and that the effects, produced by them, were entirely different from those of Levitical atonements. For which reasons, no conclusion can be drawn from them concerning the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 12. His next observation is, "That "three (*viz.* 2 Sam. xxi. 3. Exod. xxi. "29, 30. Numb. xxxv. 31, 32.) seem "to be mixed cases, relating partly to God "and partly to man. The first text proposeth both satisfaction to the Gibeonites, "and the removal of the famine which "God had inflicted. In the second, the

^h See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 107. N^o. 4

“ death due by the law of God to the
 “ owner of an ox that hath slain a man,
 “ might, by the permission of the same
 “ law, be bought off with a sum of money
 “ paid to man. In the third, God per-
 “ mitted no atonement for a murderer, &c.
 “ And man was not to take any bribe to ex-
 “ empt him from punishment¹.” Concern-
 ing these three cases, I shall make the fol-
 lowing observations.

In the *first* case, the giving satisfaction to the Gibeonites was the immediate, the removal of the famine, the more remote, effect of the atonement. The first of these effects was of a nature different from all the effects of Levitical atonements; and the mean, by which it was produced, was not only not symbolical, but the very reverse of those means by which levitical atonements were made. For which reasons, no conclusion can be drawn from the nature of this atonement about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices. The second effect of this atonement coincides with those of Levitical atonements, and will be considered under the *Dr's* next observation.

In the case which is set forth in the *second* of these three texts, the judge or civil magistrate was left at liberty to accept of a

¹ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 107. No. 5.

mulct, or sum of money, for, and in lieu of, the offender's life. And in the offender's submitting to this vicarious punishment, and paying the mulct imposed on him, did the ransom of his life, or the atonement that was made for it, consist. This case, therefore, if it doth supply any conclusion about the nature and design of Levitical sacrifices, that conclusion will not be found to be favourable to the *Dr's* notion of their being of a symbolical nature: for it is this, that the making atonement did consist in vicarious punishment inflicted, not, indeed, upon the sacrifice, but upon the offender himself. And how the *Dr.* may relish this notion of atonement, or sacrifice, I know not. But whether he doth, or doth not, approve of it, the atonement mentioned in this text, gives no countenance or support to his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, but is directly against it.

The *third* text, in this class, is, *Exod. xxi. 31, 32.* The thing there forbidden, is, the taking any atonement, that is, satisfaction, or mulct in money, for, and in lieu of, the life of a murderer; or for, and in lieu of, the confinement of a man-slayer in the city of refuge. This text, therefore, plainly suggests, that, in some cases, atonement might be made by the civil magistrate's substituting, and accepting of, a lighter punishment in lieu of a heavier one; a suggestion

which is very unfavourable to the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical nature of Levitical atonements, or sacrifices. The mean, by which, it is supposed, this atonement might have been made, was not symbolical of address to God, or of any thing else. It was the suffering of a lighter punishment in lieu of a heavier one. There is no inference, therefore, which can be drawn from the nature of this atonement, but what makes directly against the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 13. THE *Dr's* last observation, is, that
 “ the remaining twenty-six are cases be-
 “ tween the most high God and man, and
 “ relate to his favour or displeasure, and to
 “ judgments or blessings from him alone.”
 (These twenty-six cases are those which are exhibited in the following texts, *viz.* Exod. xxii. 30.—xxx. 15, 16. Numb. xvi. 46, 47.—xxv. 13.—xxxii. 50. 2 Sam. xxi. 3. Deut. xxi. 8.—xxxii. 43. Numb. xxxv. 33. Psal. lxxv. 3.—lxxix. 9. Prov. xvi. 6. Isai. vi. 7.—xxii. 14.—xxvii. 7, 8, 9. Ezek. xvi. 60—63. Isai. xlvii. 11. Deut. xxi. 8. 2 Chron. xxx. 18. Psal. lxxxviii. 37. Jer. xviii. 23. Exod. xxx. 12. Job xxxiii. 24.—xxxvi. 18. Prov. xxi. 18. Isai. xliii. 3. Psal. xlix. 7^k.)

^k Scrip. doc. of Aton. ex. Chap. VI. § 107. N^o. 6.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 71

§. 14. To the cases of this class belongs the atonement which was made in the case of the Gibeonites, as far as it had for its effect, the removal of the famine which the Israelites suffered as a punishment for the oppression of these Gibeonites: for it supplies us with the same idea of atonement. And, therefore, what is said of them, will be applicable to this.

§. 15. THE most part of the texts of this class, supply us with instances of extra-levitical atonements which had the pardon of sin, or the removal of punishment, for their effect; which was, likewise, the effect that was produced by many of the levitical sacrifices. It is, therefore, in these texts, if in any, that we can expect to meet with such assertions, hints, and suggestions as may furnish us with reasons to conclude, that Jewish sacrifices were of a symbolical nature and intention. It will, therefore, be proper here, to be particularly careful in the examination of all that the *Dr.* has said about these texts, and of all the inferences which he has drawn from them; and to try, as far as we can, whether his main conclusion has, or has not, any support from them, *viz.* "That Jewish sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God, expressing by outward signs, what is expressed in prayer and praise by words, or in the course of life by deeds."—Before I

enter upon this subject, I must confess, that my expectation of finding any thing in these texts that has a tendency to confirm or support this notion of Jewish sacrifices, is very small. For though the effect, produced by these sacrifices, and by the atonements mentioned in the texts of this class, was the same; yet the mean, by which it was produced in the former case, was so different from the several means by which it was produced in the latter, that I cannot see, that there can be any reasoning from the nature of these extra-levitical atonements to that of Jewish sacrifices, that can be thought to be conclusive and satisfactory: for when means of a different nature concur in the production of the same effect, these means must, of necessity, exert their efficacy, in the production of that effect, after a different manner. But let us see what the *Dr.* says in this affair.

§. 16. THE first thing he says, is, “ In “ two of these cases, sin is neither expressed “ nor implied¹. ”—These two cases are those which are exhibited, Prov. xxi. 18. Isai. xliii. 3. In which two texts, the sufferings of the wicked are mentioned, as being a ransom or atonement for the righteous, or the means of their deliverance and happiness.

¹ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 107. N^o. 6.

'Tis manifest, therefore, that these two texts treat of an affair in which Jewish sacrifices never had, never could have, any concern. And therefore, 'tis impossible, that they should supply any inference, hint, or suggestion in support of the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical nature of these sacrifices, or, indeed, concerning any other notion of the nature of them.

§. 17. THE *Dr.* proceeds thus, " In the rest of them, (*i. e.* of the texts of this class,) sin is expressed or implied. Now here we are to consider, I. The effect of the atonement. And II. The means by which it was made."

I. " The effect is the pardon of sin variously expressed or implied.—Sometimes it is expressed by the forgiveness, or taking, or purging away, or cleansing of sin.—Sometimes by the removal, and, in negative atonement, by the inflicting and continuing of calamitys; or the bestowing of blessings.—Sometimes, partly by the forgiving, or not forgiving of sin, partly by the removal or not removal of calamitys."

II. " The means by which atonement was made, are such as God affords and provides, or such as men devise."

" 1st. Such as God affords and provides: as (1.) His own goodness and mercy alone.—(2.) Prayer.—(3.) Instruction, prayer,

“ prayer, and repentance.—(4.) Acts of
 “ virtue and justice.—(5.) Disciplinary vi-
 “ sitations.—(6.) An offering to the service
 “ of religion.—(7.) Sufferings of some
 “ which turn to the benefit of others.”

“ 2dly. Such as men devise, as counsels,
 “ riches, forces, or any shifts they use to
 “ preserve and secure themselves.”

§. 18. HERE one would have expected, to find the *Dr.* applying the texts of this class to his main purpose, by making these criticisms, and pointing out these affirmations, hints, or suggestions, upon which his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices has its dependence. But instead of this, he only gives us an account of the effect of these extra-levitical atonements which are mentioned in them, and of the several means by which these atonements were made; without drawing one single inference from it, or any part of it, about the nature of Levitical sacrifices or atonements. And this omission is the more surprising, because the establishment of his main point did entirely depend on a contrary management.

§. 19. AND, indeed, in these texts, as far as I can see, there is nothing at all; nothing affirmed, hinted, or suggested; from which

^m See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 107. N°. 6. and §. 108,

it can be fairly inferred, that Levitical, particular sacrifices were “symbolical addresses
 “ to God, expressing by outward signs,
 “ what is expressed in prayer by words,
 “ or in the course of life by deeds.”—’Tis true, that the effect of the atonements mentioned in them, and of those sacrifices which were offered for sin, was the same, viz. the pardon of sin, or the removal of such calamities as had been inflicted as the punishment of it: and, therefore, both of them were subservient to the same end. But though they were thus productive of the same effect, (yet, because the means were different,) it will not follow, that these atonements for sin, were of the same nature, or that they were made after the same or a similar manner. Extra-levitical atonements for sin, as the *Dr.* very well observes, were made by, or through, the mercy of God, prayer, instruction, repentance, acts of virtue and justice, disciplinary visitations, or an offering to the service of religion: but Levitical atonements were made by means of a very different nature; even by the oblation of slain animals, or of the tenth part of an *ephah of fine flour*. The atonements, therefore, which were made by means that were of such a different and dissimilar nature, must have been of a dissimilar nature, and made after a different manner. This is a conclusion
 which

which naturally arises from the different nature of the means whereby Levitical and extra-levitical atonements were made. And it is the only inference, I think, that can be fairly drawn from it.—Again, the texts of this class, speak only of extra-levitical atonements, their effect, and the several means by which they were made: But they say nothing about Levitical sacrifices or atonements; nor supply us with any hint, or suggestion, from which any conclusion can be drawn about the nature of them, unless it should be supposed, that there is some spell or mystery in the word atonement. And, therefore, from these texts we can learn nothing about the nature of Levitical sacrifices or atonements.—Finally, the means by which the extra-levitical atonements, mentioned in these texts, were made, were literal and unfigurative: and, therefore, if they do supply us with any inference or conclusion about the nature of Levitical atonements, it is this, that the means, by which these atonements were made, were not symbolical or emblematical, but literal and unfigurative; a conclusion, which is the very reverse of that which the *Dr's* notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices requires to be drawn from them.

§. 20. BUT, because the pardon of sin is mentioned in scripture, as being the effect of atonements, both Levitical and extra-levi-

levitical ; the *Dr.* perhaps may think, that this is a sufficient ground for this conclusion, " That these two kinds of atonements were, " in some sense or other, of a similar nature ;" and consequently, " that these " Levitical sacrifices, by which atonement " was made for sin, must have been symbols of prayer, repentance, and of the " other means by which extra-levitical " atonements were made for sin." These two conclusions, I must confess, are exactly calculated for the *Dr.*'s purpose. But then, before they are admitted, their connection with, and dependence on, what is said in the texts of this class, must be cleared up ; which is not yet done ; nor, as far as I can see, ever will be done. And if this really were done, the *Dr.* would find, that his work was but half done ; because the hypothesis of the emblematical nature of these piacular sacrifices which were offered to make atonement for sin, will not explain, nor account for, the nature of these piacular sacrifices which were offered with another view, and to subserve different ends. But as the *Dr.* himself draws neither of these two inferences from the texts mentioned, nor any other, in order to support his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, 'tis needless to say any thing further about this affair.

78 *Dr. TAYLOR's Sentiments of* Part I.

§. 21. I HAVE now taken a particular and accurate view of the *Dr's* arrangement of the 37 texts of scripture, which treat of extra-levitical atonements; and have shewn, I think, that no one of those texts, nor any particular class or assortment of them, gives any countenance or support to his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices; yea, that he himself, no where applies any of those texts for the support either of that, or of any other notion, about the nature of these sacrifices.

§. 22. BUT tho' the *Dr.* draws no conclusion, for the support of his main point, either from any one of those texts, or from any particular assortment of them; yet he draws several conclusions from the *whole*. And though I cannot well tell, what he means by this *whole*; yet it will be proper, to examine those conclusions which he draws from it, in order to see, whether they are right drawn, and whether they have any tendency to confirm his sentiments about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 23. THE *Dr's* first inference from the *whole*, is, "That forgiveness of sin is exemption from punishmentⁿ."—This inference is an undoubted scripture-truth. But it doth not follow, from the whole of what either the *Dr.* says, or the scriptures

ⁿ See Scrip. doc. of Aton. ex. Chap. VI. §. III.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 79

do say, concerning extra-levitical atonements; nor yet from any of the before-mentioned 37 texts of scripture, excepting those which are found in the last class of the *Dr's* arrangement of them. And, even in this class, there are two texts, from which no such inference can be drawn. But what I am, here, chiefly concerned to take notice of, is, that this inference has no tendency to confirm or support the *Dr's* notion about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 24. The *Dr's* next inference from the whole, is, "That the means of making atonement for sin are not uniform; but that any mean whereby sinners are reformed, and the judgments of God averted, is atoning, or making atonement, for their sins, as, the sole goodness of God, the prayers of good men, repentance, disciplinary visitation, signal acts of justice and virtue °."—This, likewise, is a good inference from several of the texts in the last class, but not from the whole of them; much less from all the 37 texts which treat of extra-levitical atonements. But the thing which demands our chief notice here, is, that this inference makes nothing for the *Dr's* main purpose, which is, to prove, "That piacular sacrifices were

° See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 112.

" symbols

“ symbols of prayer, repentance, and good
“ dispositions of mind :” for, from the dif-
formity of those means, by which extra-
levitical atonements were made, no good
argument can be taken, whereby to prove
any thing concerning the nature of Leviti-
cal atonements, or of the means by which
they were made, Yea, the different nature
of the means, by which extra-levitical a-
tonements were made, gives us ground
to think, that these very atonements were
made in a different and dissimilar manner :
consequently, that, in the several texts re-
lating to them, the Hebrew word, which
either is, or ought to be, rendered atonement,
or making atonement, is to be understood
not in one uniform sense, but in several dif-
ferent senses, according to the different na-
ture and efficacy of the different means by
which these atonements were made. If so;
it will be extremely difficult, to determine,
in what sense we are to understand this
Hebrew word, when it is used to denote
the efficacy or effect of Jewish sacrifices,
even supposing that sense to be one or
other of those senses in which it is used
in these texts which relate to extra-le-
vitical atonements: for since this word is
used in a variety of senses in those texts, it
will be very difficult to determine, with
any degree of evidence, in which of these
different senses it is to be understood in
these

these places, which relate to Levitical atonements or sacrifices. Besides, this ambiguous word's being used in such a variety of senses in those texts which relate to extra-levitical atonements, gives one ground to think, that it may bear a sense different from all these, in those texts which relate to Levitical atonements: and this suspicion will be greatly strengthened, and even converted into an high degree of probability, when it is considered, that, among all the means whereby extra-levitical atonements were made, there is not one to be found, that was of a symbolical nature, or, of the same nature with those by which the *Dr.* supposes Levitical atonements to have been made.—This inference, therefore, which the *Dr.* draws, instead of being, in any manner, conducive to confirm or support his notion about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, has, in all the respects mentioned, a direct tendency, if not to confute and subvert, yet to render it, in the highest degree, improbable.

§. 25. THE *Dr.*'s third inference from the *whole*, is, “ That the giving an equivalent “ to God is no ways included in the notion of atonement.” And the fourth is, “ That the transferring of guilt doth not “ belong to the sense of atonement^p. ”——

These two are good inferences from the whole of the *Dr.*'s 37 texts of scripture, and

G

from

^p See Scrip. doc. of Aton. Chap. VI. §. 113, 114.

from the whole matter contained in them, according to the view which he has given us of it : for there is no instance of atonement, exhibited in either of these two wholes, that implies, yea, that doth not exclude, the notions, both of giving an equivalent to God, and of transferring guilt.—But when all this is admitted, it will not follow, that the notion of giving an equivalent to God, or that of transferring guilt, doth not belong to the sense of Levitical sacrifices or atonements. The texts of scripture mentioned, only tell us, what was included, or not included, in the notion and sense of extra-levitical atonements : but they determine nothing at all about what was included, or not included, in the idea and sense of Levitical sacrifices or atonements. And, therefore, it is a wrong way of reasoning, to argue, that, because the notions of giving an equivalent to God, and of transferring guilt, were not included in the sense of extra-levitical atonements, therefore, they are not included in the sense of levitical atonements. The exclusion of these notions from the idea of the former, doth not prove, that they belong not to the sense of the latter. 'Tis very possible, that neither of these notions may belong to the sense of Levitical sacrifices or atonements ; and there are reasons to think, that they do not : but then the proof of this must be brought from some other topic, than that of their not belonging

belonging to the sense of extra-levitical atonements.—But what I am chiefly concerned to remark here, is, that these two inferences, even supposing they were good and conclusive, with regard to Jewish sacrifices; yet they are no way subservient to the *Dr's* main purpose, which is to prove, that piacular sacrifices were symbols of prayer, repentance, and good moral dispositions of mind. For, if we should suppose, that giving an equivalent to God, and the transferring of guilt, are wrong notions of piacular sacrifices; yet it will not follow, from these being wrong notions of them, that the *Dr's* notion of them is the right one. And, for any thing that he has yet proved to the contrary, it may be as wide of truth, as either of the other two.

§. 26. THESE then are all the inferences, which the *Dr.* has drawn from what he has exhibited, and said, about the nature of extra-levitical atonements. And it now appears, I think, that no one of them comes up to his main point, or amounts to a good proof, or even to any shadow of a proof of this, “ That Jewish sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God, expressing by outward signs, what is expressed in prayer and praise by words, or in the course of life by deeds:” but that, on the contrary, there is something in the nature of

some of these atonements, perhaps of them all, which has the appearance of a proof of the falshood of this notion of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 27. BUT though the *Dr.* has not drawn any inference from extra-levitical atonements, or from any thing that he has said about them, that is subservient to his main point; yet, in winding up this head, he draws a conclusion from the *whole*, which makes ample amends for all defects. This conclusion the *Dr.* draws in the following words, *viz.* "From the *whole* we may, I think, truly conclude, that sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God, expressing by outward signs, what is expressed in prayer and praise by words, or in the course of life by deeds ^a."

§. 28. THIS conclusion exhibits the *Dr.*'s definition of sacrifices of all kinds, whether piacular sacrifices or peace-offerings. Now, in that part of his book which treats of extra-levitical atonements, he says nothing about peace-offerings. The *whole*, therefore, from which the *Dr.* draws this conclusion, must comprehend not only all that he has said about extra-levitical atonements; but, likewise, all that he has said in the second chapter of his book, about the meaning, design,

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 118.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 85

design, and efficacy of Jewish sacrifices; where, indeed, he endeavours to prove the truth of this conclusion, in relation both to peace-offerings, and piacular sacrifices: consequently, this *whole* must comprehend whatever the *Dr.* in the foregoing part of his book, has said, or advanced, in support of his opinion about the symbolical nature of sacrifices.—But all the parts of this *whole* I have already examined, and have shewn, that no one of them contains, or affords, any premises, from which this conclusion can be fairly, and with any degree of evidence, drawn. And since it cannot be rightly drawn from any one of these parts, 'tis manifest, that it cannot be drawn from the aggregate of these parts, or the *whole* itself. Wherefore, we cannot truly conclude from this *whole*, “ That sacrifices were
“ symbolical addresses to God, expressing
“ by outward signs, what is expressed in
“ prayer and praise by words, or in the
“ course of life by deeds.” And, consequently, that the *Dr.*'s opinion, about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, remains unsupported by any thing he has yet advanced in support of it.

§. 29. THE *Dr.* to strengthen his conclusion from the *whole*, subjoins, “ And
“ surely it must confirm this sentiment (*i. e.*
“ about the symbolical nature of Jewish
“ sacrifices) beyond all doubt, when the

“ scripture, every where, declares, that
 “ without sincere prayers and thanksgiv-
 “ ings, without repentance, faith, and obe-
 “ dience, all sacrifices, were not only un-
 “ profitable, as to the favour of God, and
 “ his pardoning mercy; but also detestable
 “ in his sight: and when the prophets una-
 “ nimously agree, that it was not any thing
 “ in the most numerous, expensive, or
 “ pompous sacrifices that had any effect
 “ with God, but only *doing justly, loving*
 “ *mercy, and walking humbly with God*.”

§. 30. ANSW. I acknowledge, that the scripture every where declares, that, without repentance and sincere obedience, all sacrifices were not only unprofitable, as to God's favour and pardoning mercy, but detestable in his sight; and that it declares, likewise, that *the sacrifices of the wicked, were an abomination to the Lord*, and that the most numerous, expensive, and pompous oblations, unaccompanied with repentance and obedience, *doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God*, would not avail to procure the favour of God, or to avert deserved punishment.—But, as far as I can find, neither scripture, nor prophet, any where declare, (as the *Dr.* says, they do,) “ that it was not any thing in the most nu-
 “ merous,

^h See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VI. §. 119.

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 87

“ merous, expensive, or pompous sacrifices
“ (whether of good or of wicked men)
“ that had any effect with God, but only
“ *doing justly, loving mercy, and walking*
“ *humbly with God.*” On the contrary, it is
frequently declared, that the sacrifices of good
men, as well as their piety, were acceptable
to God, and actually accepted by him; and
had such effect with him, that they were
the real means of obtaining blessings from
him. See Gen. iv. 4.—viii. 19. Levit.
chapters v, and vi. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. Job
xlii. 8, 9. Psal. xx. 3. Isai. lvi. 7. Ezek.
xliii. 7, &c.—To which let me add, that
this doctrine of the *Dr*’s if it were true,
would prove too much, even that the insti-
tution of sacrifices was altogether useless,
and, therefore, unreasonable, and the more
so, because it was burthensome.

§. 31. BUT notwithstanding the scripture
has declared, that sacrifices, without repen-
tance and sincere obedience, were unpro-
fitable, as to the favour and pardoning mer-
cy of God, and even detestable to him;
yet I cannot see, how this declaration should
be an undoubted confirmation, or any con-
firmation at all, of the *Dr*’s opinion about
the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices;
unless we lay it down for a maxim, that
where two things are mentioned as being
concerned in the production of one effect,
and it is said, that that effect cannot be pro-

duced by the one without the other; there the thing, of which it is said, that it cannot produce the effect without the other, must, in all cases, be understood to be a symbol or emblem of that other thing. For unless this be admitted as a maxim, it will not follow, that sacrifices were symbols of repentance and obedient disposition, merely because it said, that "sacrifices, without these, were unprofitable as to the favour and pardoning mercy of God, and even detestable to him." But this maxim, upon the truth of which the truth of the *Dr's* argument depends, is evidently false, as might be shewn from many instances of real facts, if it were needful. I shall only mention two, *viz.* moisture is a known cause of the fertility of the earth; but, without heat, it can conduce nothing towards the fertility of the earth: and yet it cannot with any truth, be hence inferred, that moisture is a symbol of heat. —Again, to take an instance from a case, that is pretty similar to that which we are considering; the performance of the external dutys of religion is one mean, whereby an interest in the favour and pardoning mercy of God may be secured: but the performance of these external dutys, unaccompanied with repentance, faith, and obedient disposition, instead of contributing, in any degree, towards the securing an interest in

in the blessings mentioned, is utterly unprofitable, and even detestable in the sight of God: and yet it cannot be hence inferred, that the external dutys of religion are symbols of repentance, faith, and obedient disposition. But though this inference cannot be drawn from these premises, yet there is the same reason for drawing it from them, that the *Dr.* had for drawing his inference, concerning the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, from the scripture's declaring that "all sacrifices, without repentance and obedient disposition, were unprofitable, as to the favour and pardoning mercy of God, and detestable in his sight." Wherefore, if the inference be faulty in the one case, it must be equally faulty in the other. Upon the whole, we may, I think, truly conclude, that this declaration of scripture, upon which the *Dr.* builds so much, is so far from being an undoubted confirmation, that it is no confirmation at all, of his opinion concerning the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices.

§. 32. THAT which appears to me to have been true matter of fact in this case, is this; to the making atonement for sin, under the law of Moses, both repentance, expressed by a verbal confession of the sin, and, likewise, the oblation of a sacrifice, were made necessary by the appointments of that law: and, for this reason, atone-
ment

ment could not be made for any sin by either of the two, without the other. Repentance was necessary, in this affair, as a moral qualification in the sinner for pardon. The sacrifice, likewise, had its use and end in it, as an oblation to God for the sin which had been committed.—And may we not conceive of all this in a rational way, without supposing the sacrifice to have been a symbol either of repentance or of penitent address to God, and without contradicting any one single dictate of reason, or common sense? Surely this is very possible. Repentance, without doubt, was the only moral turn or disposition of mind, that could fit and qualify the offender for favour and pardon. This will be readily granted. And as to the sacrifice; (about the nature of which there is much dispute;) might not this have been a very fit and proper instrument of divine government, instituted with a view to render the grant or conveyance of pardon to the offender, consistent with the wisdom, goodness, security, end, and rectitude of divine government, by preserving a due difference between the treatment of the penitent offender, and the treatment of all other persons, who had behaved in another way than he had done? The possibility of conceiving thus of the meaning, design, and efficacy of such sacrifices as were offered to make atonement for particular

ticular sins which had been committed, cannot be much questioned among thinking persons. But whether the *Dr.* will, or will not, think fit, to conceive of them after this manner; enough has been said, to shew, that what he alledges here, from the scripture, as an undoubted confirmation of his sentiment concerning the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, is no confirmation or proof of it at all.

§. 33. HAVING now examined whatever the *Dr.* has said in support of his notion about the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, I might, here, put a period to this part of my work. But that I may leave nothing unexamined that the *Dr.* has advanced in relation to his system, I shall, before I drop the subject, examine two passages in his book which have not yet been considered, and which, because they are no part either of his system, or of the evidence of it, but only relate to the method in which he has proceeded in his inquiry after the meaning, efficacy, and design of Jewish sacrifices, or atonements, I have purposely reserved the consideration of them to this place.—One of these passages is that which we have, Chap. IV. §. 69. where the *Dr.* says, “ Therefore by comparing such passages, (*i. e.* the passages in the Levitical law, where atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice,) we shall gain no
“ advan-

“ advantage; because they are not so many
 “ different instances of a known sense,
 “ (*i. e.* of the word *atonement*,) but are to
 “ be considered only as one single instance
 “ of a doubtful sense.” — The other pas-
 sage occurs Chap. V. §. 70. where he says,
 “ The texts then, which we are to examine,
 “ are those where the word (*i. e.* which is
 “ rendered *atonement*) is used extra-leviti-
 “ cally, or with no relation to sacrifices;
 “ that we may be able to judge what it
 “ imports, when applied to them.”

§. 34. ANSW. The *Dr.* from what he says, in the first of these two passages, seems to think, that the sense of the word *atonement*, or of the Hebrew word which is rendered *atonement*, in these places of the Levitical law where *atonement* is said to be made for persons by sacrifice, cannot be discovered by comparing these places and their contexts together, nor from any thing that is said in the Levitical law about atonements of this kind. And, in the second passage, the *Dr.* seems to hint, that the sense of this word may be discovered, and can only be discovered, by examining and finding out the sense, which it bears in those places where it is used extra-levitically, or with no relation to Jewish sacrifices. — But I am of opinion, that the *Dr.* has, by these sentiments, been misled from the road to truth in his enquiries: for I take them to be
 those

those capital mistakes, by which he has been led into a wrong notion about the meaning and nature of Levitical sacrifices or atonements. The following observations will shew whether these sentiments of mine are right or wrong.

§. 35. THE *Dr's* first passage is an inference from an observation, which goes before it, and which is this, "In all places of the Levitical law, where atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice, the word, as far I can perceive, is every where used in one uniform sense." The truth, therefore, of the inference itself, even supposing it to be drawn in a right manner, must depend on the truth of this observation, and either stand or fall with it. But the observation is false and groundless; and, therefore, the inference drawn from it, must be so too. That the observation is false and groundless, I prove thus;—In the Levitical law, we find, that piacular sacrifices, such as burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, were appointed to be offered for persons, not only in cases where moral evil or sin was committed, but in cases, likewise, where ceremonial pollution was contracted, yea, and in cases, also, where no sin was committed, nor any ceremonial pollution contracted; and that, in all these cases, atonement is said to be made for persons, by the sacrifices which were offered.

See

See Levit. chapters v, vi, xii, xiv, xv, xvi, &c. Now, though the means, by which atonements were made in each of these different cases, considered as sacrifices, were of the same nature; yet, because these means were directed to a different purpose, and produced a different effect, in each of the three cases mentioned, the atonements which were made by them, must have been of a very different nature: consequently, the word *atonement* must bear a different sense in each of these cases. The word atonement, in the following expressions, *viz.* atonement made, or making, for sin, or vice; atonement made, or making, for ceremonial pollution; atonement made, or making, for persons where there was neither sin, nor ceremonial pollution; I say, the word atonement, in these expressions, must have as different a sense as the words vice, ceremonial pollution, and the being untainted by either of the two, have, whether we can discover it, or not: for it is self-evident, that, in cases of such a different nature, atonement could not be made for persons in the same sense of the word. Hence it is manifest, that the *Dr's* observation, *viz.* That "in all places of the Levitical law, where atonement is said to be made by sacrifice for persons, the word is used in one uniform sense," is void of all truth; and consequently, that
the

the inference, which he draws from it, has nothing to support it.

§. 36. 2dly. If the *Dr.*'s observation was a true and just one, (as it is not,) yet the inference, which he draws, would not follow from it: that is, if it really were true, that the word *atonement*, in all the places where atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice, is every where used in one uniform sense; yet it would not follow, as the *Dr.* thinks, "that we can gain no advantage towards the discovery of the true sense of that word in these places, by comparing them and their contexts together." If, indeed, by comparing these passages, the *Dr.* means, the bare inspection of the word *atonement* in them, and the comparing the letters and syllables, of which it is composed, in each of them, or the sounds which these letters and syllables yield in pronunciation; 'tis most certain, that, by thus comparing these passages, we can gain no advantage towards the discovery of the true sense which the word bears in them. But if, by comparing these passages, he means, a careful investigation of the connection, thread, and drift of the discourses of which they are parts; a close attention to whatever is said in them, and in the surrounding contexts, concerning the cases in which, the occasions on which, and the view and design with which, atonements were

were made for persons by sacrifice; a careful observation of every hint that is given in these passages, and in their contexts, concerning the nature and sense of atonement; and, lastly, a careful putting of all these hints together, and a judicious comparing of them with one another; I say, if the *Dr.* by comparing the passages in which atonement is said to be made for persons by Levitical sacrifices, means this way of comparing and examining them, is it not very possible, to make a discovery, by this method of investigation, of the true sense which the word atonement bears in them, even though it should have but one uniform sense in them all? In this way of proceeding, the uniformity of the sense of the word can be no hinderance to the discovery of it, because it is not supposed to be one of those means by which the sense of it is to be discovered.—In truth, it is by the means which have been mentioned, fewer or more of them, that we discover the sense of ambiguous words in all passages, wherever we meet with them: nor is it possible to conceive of any means, besides these, whereby to investigate, and find out, the true sense of a word of doubtful signification in any particular passage of a book, or writing.—By the help of a dictionary, or verbal information, we may, indeed, learn the various significations of an ambiguous word;

word; but, without a due use of the rules of criticism mentioned, 'tis impossible to discover in which of these significations it is used in any particular passage of a book, the sense of it, in such a passage, being naturally incapable of being investigated by any other means. In order to discover the sense of such a word, in some particular passage of a book, we may, if we please, pursue the same measures which the *Dr.* has taken to find out the sense of the word *atonement* in these places where it is used le-
viticallly. We may read over the whole book; mark down all the passages where the word occurs; investigate the sense in which it is used in each of them; (which, by the bye, cannot be done, but in a due use of fewer or more of the before-men-
tioned rules of criticism;) bring all these senses of the word together, and compare them with one another; sort the passages, in which the word occurs, into diverse classes, according to its various significations: but when all this tedious work has been dispatched, the following questions will still recur, in which of these senses is the word to be understood in this particular passage? And, whether may not the word bear a sense in it, different from all these which it hath in other places? Questions, which cannot be solved by any thing that

H

has

has yet been done; nor satisfactorily cleared up, but in a due use of the rules of criticism before-mentioned. Recourse, therefore, must be had to these rules of criticism, before these questions can be solved, or any thing done towards the discovery of the sense of the word in the passage under consideration. And since recourse must be had to them at last, and before any thing can be done to purpose, would it not be much better to have recourse to them at the beginning, than to go such a long and tedious round of speculation, that can give no light into the subject of inquiry? To conclude, what has been said is sufficient, I think, to shew that the *Dr's* inference, under consideration, is both drawn from a wrong observation, and has no truth in it; yea, and that it is an inference of bad consequence, as having a tendency to set inquisitive minds upon a false scent, and into a wrong road, in their searches after truth.

§. 37. In the other passage, which I have quoted, the *Dr.* suggests, that, in these places of the Levitical law, where atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice, the sense of the word *atonement*, or rather of the Hebrew word which is rendered *atonement*, may be discovered, and can only be discovered, by examining and finding out the sense which it bears in these places

I.
red
ism
re,
be-
any
the
on-
had
can
uch
be-
ous
ght
de,
to
nfi-
ob-
and
ce,
nds
ad,
ave
ese
ne-
cri-
or
en-
and
and
ese
ces

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 99

places where it is used extra-levitically, or with no relation to sacrifices.

§. 38. ANSW. What hath been already said, in answer to the *Dr's* last passage, shews, that it is impossible to discover the sense of the word *atonement* in these passages of the levitical law, by the *Dr's* method. And, therefore, if the sense of this word, in these places, is not found out in a different way, even by these rules of sober and just criticism, which have been mentioned, I am pretty sure, that it never will be discovered. This may serve as an answer to the *Dr's* hint concerning the possibility of an impossible thing. But I add, *ex abundanti*, that the *Dr.* himself has actually tried this method of his, in order to discover the sense of the word *atonement*, in these places of the Levitical law, where atonement is said to be made for persons by sacrifice. But what has he gained by making this experiment? Just nothing. He has not been able to produce one single text, relating to extra-levitical atonements, which contains or implies his own notion of Levitical atonements; or which affords one single hint, or suggestion, from which it can be fairly and justly inferred. So far from this, that he hath not ventured to affirm, that any one text, of this class, contains such a hint, or to draw a single inference from any of them

concerning the nature of Levitical atonements; as I have shewn in the course of my examination of his book. All, therefore, that the *Dr.* has done, in making this experiment, is vain and lost labour. And after all that he has said, and explained, and proved, about the nature of extra-levitical atonements, we are left as much in the dark as ever, about the nature of Levitical atonements and sacrifices.

§. 39. HAVING now examined all the scripture-evidence which the *Dr.* has produced in support of his notion of the symbolical nature of Jewish sacrifices, and his method of proceeding in the proof of this point; I shall, here, conclude this part of my work, with a few reflections upon the *Dr's* notion of the meaning and nature of Jewish, piacular sacrifices, as being symbols of penitent disposition, and penitent address to God.

§. 40. I observe in general, that could the *Dr's* notion of piacular sacrifices be really proved to be the scripture notion of them, instead of serving to set the doctrines of revelation about this species of sacrifices in a rational light, it would only furnish people of sceptical minds, with unanswerable objections against them. For

First. In many cases, piacular sacrifices were appointed to be offered when no sin,
or

Chap. II. *Jewish Sacrifices examined.* 101

or sins, had been committed, that could be a ground or reason for penitent disposition, or for penitent address to God for pardon, either literal or symbolical. And, in all cases of this kind, the *Dr's* notion of particular sacrifice doth not supply us with any account of the meaning, design, or use of these sacrifices which were appointed to be offered: consequently, these sacrifices must, upon his scheme, appear to have been quite useless.

Secondly. In the oblation of those very sacrifices, which were offered for sins, there was not only the oblation of a slain animal, but an express, verbal confession of the sins committed, and a literal prayer to God for pardon: not only so, but the penitential confession and prayer always preceded the oblation of the sacrificial animal. Now, upon the supposition, that the oblation of the animal was a symbol of penitential confession and prayer, these facts, which I have mentioned, will supply an inference that is very unfavourable to this notion of sacrifice; which is this, *viz.* that the oblation of the animal was neither needful nor useful. The thing, of which the sacrificial animal is supposed to have been a symbol, was itself present. Of what use then was the symbol of it, or what imaginable end could it answer? As a symbol of penitent disposition,

there was neither room nor occasion for it, because that disposition was better, and more naturally, expressed by the penitential confession and prayer which went before it. And to the production of penitent disposition in the mind of the offerer, the oblation of the sacrifice could contribute nothing, because that disposition is supposed to have been both produced, and properly expressed, before it came in play, or could have any influence upon the mind. What end then could these symbols of penitent disposition answer, since there was no manner of occasion for them as representations or expressions of such a disposition; and since they neither were, nor could be, productive of it? No end, as far as I can see, unless it was to put the offerers of them to needless trouble and expense.

§. 41. Now, if the *Dr's* notion of particular sacrifices, which supplies us with this inference, that these sacrifices were useless institutions, should prove to be the true scripture-notion of them; I need not say, what grounds of just triumph would be hereby afforded to deists and men of sceptical minds; and how ready they would be to rally christians for their weakness and credulity. Would not persons of this turn of mind, be apt to argue in the following manner? From the very notion, which
your

your divine oracles give of piacular sacrifices, (which were a heavy and grievous burden to the Jews,) it appears, that they were useless and unprofitable institutions; and that they neither did, nor could, answer any one good end, or wise design, in any case whatsoever. How then can you, christians, shew, that the institution of these sacrifices was consistent with the wisdom of God, who never acts without reason and design; yea, without proposing to himself a good end and wise design in whatsoever he doth? Or how can you reconcile the institution of such burthenfome and oppressive rites with the goodness of the Deity, who is incapable of taking any pleasure in the sufferings and distresses of his creatures, and is always concerned and active to promote their happiness? And if you cannot bring the institution of them to any consistency with the wisdom and goodness of God, how can you believe that book to be a divine revelation, which ascribes to him the institution of them?—If an handle were given to sceptical minds, from any doctrine of revealed religion, to reason after this manner, how would it be possible to answer their arguments, or to check their triumph! but, I hope, that as the *Dr's* notion of piacular sacrifices has, upon the strictest examination, been found to have no sup-

port from the holy scriptures; so the true scripture-notion of these sacrifices, when once it comes to be set in a proper light, may be found, to be perfectly conformable to the wisdom and goodness of the Deity, and such as will, at once, stop the mouth of the infidel, and give solid, rational satisfaction to the believer.

The END of the FIRST PART.



APPEN-



A P P E N D I X I.

Containing remarks on some passages, in Dr. Taylor's scripture-doctrine of atonement examined, relating to Jewish sacrifices and atonements, which have not been considered in the foregoing sheets.

P A S S A G E 1st.

“ T H E sins and trespasses for which
“ they (*i. e.* piacular sacrifices) were
“ offered, were generally sins of igno-
“ rance, or ceremonial pollutions.” (For
this he refers to many texts of scripture;
and, among others, to Numb. xv. 22. And
then says,) “ It is added, ver. 30. *But the*
“ *soul that doth ought presumptuously, the same*
“ *reproacheth the Lord, and that soul shall*
“ *be cut off from his people.* No sacrifices
“ were to be offered for him that *did ought*
“ *presumptuously, i. e.* knowingly and wil-
“ fully. And yet there are three cases,
“ which seem to be exceptions from this
“ general rule. (1.) When a person, upon
“ his oath before a magistrate, did not
“ utter what he had seen or known, Levit.
“ v. 1. (2.) When a man dealt fraudulently
“ with his neighbour, Levit. vi, 1. (3.) The
“ vi-

“vitiating of a bond-maid, Levit. xix. 20.
 “In the rules for the day of atonement
 mention is made of *all the iniquities of the*
 “*children of Israel, and all their trans-*
 “*gressions in all their sins*, Levit. xvi. 21.
 “But those sins must be excepted which
 “were threatened with excision or cutting
 “off^a.” And to the same purpose, “The
 “sins for which sacrifices were generally
 “offered, were sins of ignorance, and ce-
 “remonial uncleanness, which were not
 “capital by law^b.”

REMARKS.

In these two passages, the *Dr.* seems to me, to speak inconsistently with himself. He allows that on the day of atonement, piacular sacrifices were offered for all sins that were not capital by law, wilful sins as well as others; and that, on all proper occasions, they were offered, likewise, for wilful sins of fraud; to which he might have added, for wilful sins of violence; since the place, to which he refers, mentions these, as well as the other, as sins for which trespass-offerings were appointed to be offered. And yet after all this, he tells us, “that the sins and trespasses for which
 “these

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. I. §. 6.

^b Ibidem, Chap. IV. §. 54.

“ these sacrifices were offered, were gene-
 “ rally sins of ignorance, or ceremonial
 “ pollutions; and that no sacrifices were to
 “ be offered for him that did ought know-
 “ ingly and wilfully, unless it was in three
 “ cases which he mentions as exceptions
 “ from a general rule.” The *Dr.* I think,
 has been led into this mistake, and incon-
 sistency with himself, by considering sins of
 ignorance, or error, as being, in scripture,
 opposed to these sins which are knowingly
 and wilfully committed: Whereas they are
 not opposed to these sins which are know-
 ingly and wilfully committed, provided they
 proceed from human frailty only, or from
 natural appetites and passions unduly raised;
 but only to such sins as proceed from a di-
 rect and deliberate contempt of authority:
 which sins are called, in scripture, sins of
 presumption; and they who commit them,
 are said, (with a peculiar emphasis) to sin
with a high hand, and *to reproach the Lord*.
 All the sins of presumption, which are men-
 tioned in the scriptures, were of this kind.
 And they, who were guilty of them, were
 very justly and deservedly ordered to be cut
 off from their people, or to be put to death,
 under the Jewish theocracy. But the persons,
 who were guilty of wilful sins of a less heinous
 nature, neither deserved, nor had, such a
 hard fate under that theocracy: for they
 were permitted to offer trespass-offerings
 for

for these sins, by which atonement was made for them. If any person will take the pains, to inspect all those places of the Hebrew bible, where the root שגו, and its conjugates and nouns, occur in their several forms, and to examine the sense which they bear in them, he will be satisfied of the truth of this observation: for he will find these as commonly and frequently used, to denote wilful sins proceeding from human frailty, or the commission of such sins, as sins of ignorance properly so called, or the commission of them. I shall only select one place from among many, where the Hebrew-root mentioned, evidently bears this sense, viz. Isai. xxviii. 7. *But they also have erred (שגו schagu) through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way: the priest and the prophet have erred (שגו schagu) through strong drink;—they err (שגו) in vision, they stumble in judgment.*

PASSAGE 2d.

The Dr. says, “ Indeed the victim might, “ and, I suppose, did, represent the person “ who offered it, in the symbolical, interpretative sense; namely, as whatever was “ done to that, was to be applied to himself, “ to shew him the demerit of sin in general, how he ought to slay the brute in “ him-

APPENDIX I. 109

“ himself, and devote his life and soul to
“ God.”

REMARKS.

All that the *Dr.* says here, is pure fancy and imagination, without any manner of support from scripture-evidence, or from any thing that is any where said in the scriptures. And, indeed, it is hard to tell, what a luxuriant imagination, set loose from all rule, whether reason or scripture, may not carry a man to suppose. The *Dr.* has before supposed, that Jewish sacrifices were symbolical addresses to God. And here he supposes that these sacrifices were symbolical persons. And, since no bounds can be set to fancy and imagination, who can tell what they may not, hereafter, be supposed to be? There is one thing which, I hope, I may be allowed to say, *viz.* That this volatile and roving faculty of imagination, as far as it has been employed in the interpretation of scripture, has made dreadful havock of the true and genuine sense of it: for which reason, I shall never be willing to admit the supposition of any emblem, symbol, allegory, or any figurative expression, in any passage of the scriptures, before I see a good reason for doing it.

* See Script. doc. of aton. Chap. IV. § 56.

it. And, therefore, if the *Dr.* would have me to receive his supposition, or fancy, in the passage now quoted, he must first take the trouble of proving the truth of it.—The expression, “a man ought to slay the brute in himself,” is very striking, and tolerably popular. But for the truth and good sense of the moral couched in it, I shall leave them to be considered by others. I should think, that the offerer of a sacrifice would have discharged his duty pretty well, had he only tamed the brute in himself and brought it under proper government, though he had not slain it, as he did his sacrifice.

P A S S A G E 3d.

The *Dr.* says, “To pitch, to smear with pitch, seems to be the natural and original sense of the word, (*i. e.* כפר *capbar*,) though it is so used but once, namely, Gen. vi. 14. וכפרת *and thou shalt pitch it within and without* בכפר *with pitch*. The sense, when it signifieth the mercy-seat, and atonement, seems to be transferred from covering or securing with pitch, to things of a different nature^d.” And to the same purpose, “In all the 37 places, (espe-

^d See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. IV. §. 63.

APPENDIX I. 111

" (especially, Ifai. xxviii. 18.) the word
 " כפר *capbar* seems to retain something of
 " what I take to be its natural and origi-
 " nal sense, viz. to cover or smear over,
 " as Gen. vi. 14. the only place, where it
 " is evidently so used.* Agreeably to this,
 the *Dr.* says, " Atonement for sin, is the
 " covering of sin." To support which, he
 quotes Neh. iv. 4, 5. Psal. xxxii. 1. Psal.
 lxxxv. 2. Jam. v. 20. In which texts, the
 pardon of sin is expressed by its being co-
 vered, and the punishment of it, by its not
 being covered†.

REMARKS.

The text, Gen. vi. 14. to which the *Dr.*
 here refers us, is as followeth, *Make thee*
an ark of Gopher-wood; rooms shalt thou make
in the ark; וקפרתה vecapharta and thou shalt
 pitch it *within and without בכפר becopher*
 with pitch. The *Dr.* thinks, that the root
 כפר *capbar* bears its natural and primary
 sense in this text; in which I agree with
 him. But then he says, that the natural
 and original signification of this root, was
 that of covering; and in this I cannot agree
 with the *Dr.* especially considering, that
 covering, in the sense of hiding or conceal-
 ing

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
 Chap. VI. §. 115.

† Ibidem §. 117.

ing a thing, is the signification of this Hebrew-root which he contends for.—The noun *copher* in this text, without doubt, signifies pitch, bitumen, or some substance of the like glutinous and tenacious nature; for no substance, of different qualities, could have answered the end intended. Now, as it is natural to think, that nouns, or the names of things, were invented and fixed before the verbs which signify actions upon or about them; and to conceive, that these verbs would be often taken from those names which were given to things, of which we have many evident instances in all languages: so it is natural to think, that the verb כָּפַר *caphar* was taken from the noun כֹּפֶר *copher*, which signifies pitch or bitumen; and that this verb, at the beginning, signified neither more nor less, than to pitch, or to apply pitch to a thing; which signification doth not imply the idea of covering, much less that of covering with a design to hide or conceal.

As to the pitching of Noah's ark; the thing intended by it, was, the filling up the spaces in the joinings, and the chinks, cracks, and vacuities in the wood, with this cement, to the end, that there might be such a close union effected in, and between, all its component parts, as might render it impenetrable by the waters of the flood. Wherefore, if the wood of the ark was not porous, but
of

of a close texture, all this might have been done, without covering the ark over with pitch. Or, if the porosity of the wood rendered it necessary to cover the whole ark with this glutinous matter, yet the covering it with it, was not the thing directly and ultimately intended, but was only subordinate to it. The principal and ultimate end, aimed at, was not the covering of the ark, but the filling the seams, chinks, cracks, and pores, of the boards of it with pitch, in order to bring all the parts of it into close contact with one another, and to preserve them in that state of union. When these things, therefore, are considered, it appears, I think, that the sense of the words pitching with pitch, in the texts before us, is rather that of pointing, cementing, or uniting, than that of covering. And when all these places in the Hebrew bible, where this verb and noun occur in a derived and figurative sense, are carefully inspected and considered, it will, I doubt not, be found, that they retain more of this sense, than that of covering.

But supposing, that the verb *capbar* did, in the text before us, signify to cover, or to hide; yet, surely, it was not the design of atonement to cover or hide sin. Yea, by the sacrificial atonements, sin, instead of being covered or hidden, was exposed to public view; and, therefore, the covering
I of

of sin is excluded from the idea of sacrificial atonement. God, indeed, is said, in some texts of scripture, to cover sin, by which is meant, that he pardons or forgives it. But between pardoning sin, and making atonement for sin, there is a wide difference. By pardon, sin is covered: by atonement, it is not; otherwise the pardon, subsequent to atonement, and by which alone sin is covered, would be useless. The texts, therefore, produced by the *Dr.* and in which God is said to cover or pardon sins, are no way to his purpose; because it doth not follow, from God's being said to cover or pardon sins, that atonements, made by sacrifice, did cover or pardon them.—The passage which the *Dr.* quotes from Jam. v. 20. relates to another affair, and is much less to his purpose than any of the others; for which reason, I shall say nothing about it here.

The place in which, above all others, the *Dr.* thinks that the verb כָּפַר *capbar* doth retain something of its natural and original signification, as signifying to cover, is Isai. xxviii. 18. *Your covenant with death כִּפּוּר cuppar shall be disannulled, (atoned,) and your agreement with hell shall not stand: when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.* The *Dr.* says that the sense of the Hebrew word *cuppar* in this text, is, it shall be blotted

blotted out, smeared over, cancelled^g, consequently, covered. But this interpretation of the Hebrew word, appears to me, to be very unnatural; because their covenant with death, as appears from the latter part of the verse, was to be atoned for by punishment, which is not a mean of covering or hiding sin, but of exposing it to public view, and the sinner himself to shame and disgrace. The words, I think, should be rendered thus, *Your covenant with death shall be atoned for*, or expiated, viz. not by sacrifice, but by punishment. And then the Hebrew verb will bear the same sense which it doth in other places, where atonement is said to be made by the execution of justice upon offenders: which is a sense very different from that of covering or hiding.

As to the Hebrew noun כפרת *caporeth*, which signifieth the mercy-seat, and is derived from the root כפר *capbar*, the *Dr.* says, "the sense of it seems to be transferred from covering, or securing with pitch, to a thing of a different nature^h." But in this the *Dr.* I think is as much mistaken, as he is about the natural and original sense of its root, *capbar*. This notion of his about the sense of the word, *caporeth*, which signifies the mercy-seat, is grounded

I 2 on

^g See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. V. §. 95. N^o. 25.

^h Ibidem Chap. IV. §. 63.

on a supposition which I take to be a false one, *viz.* that the mercy-seat was the cover of the ark. And, indeed, the mercy-seat was put above upon the ark. But then the scripture gives us no ground to think, that the mercy-seat was the cover, or any other part, of the ark. It is no where called the cover of the ark, and its being said to be put above upon the ark, only intimates, that the ark was its pedestal, and not that it was the cover of the ark: for the way and manner in which this is expressed in the Hebrew, imports no more. And to confirm the truth of this farther, I observe, 1st. That in the directions given (Exod. xx. 10—15.) for making the ark, there are none found which relate to the making of the mercy-seat. But, after all the directions, for the fabric of the ark, have been finished, then follow (ver. 17—21.) the directions for making the mercy-seat, as a thing that was different from the ark and all its appurtenances; and to place it, when made, above upon the ark, which was its pedestal. 2dly. What seems to put this beyond all doubt, is, that in the directions which are given for the fabric of the ark, all the parts of it are ordered to be made of *Shittim-wood*, and to be *over-laid with pure gold*, ver. 10, 11. But in those directions, which are given for the fabric of the mercy-seat, it is ordered, that it should be
made

made not of *Shittim-wood over-laid with gold*, but) of *pure, solid gold*, ver. 17. —

These reasons satisfy me, that the mercy-seat was not the cover, nor any other part, of the ark; though the *Dr.* and the most part of other writers, think in a different manner. And if it was not the cover of the ark, it could not be called כַּפֹּרֶת *caporeth* from its use, as being the cover of it. It is more probable, that it was so called, because it was the principal instrument that was appointed to be used on the most solemn occasions, in making atonement for sin. See Levit. xvi. 14.

These are the most material passages, besides those which have been before considered, in which the *Dr.* seems to me to have mistaken, and departed from the sense of revelation, in that part of his book which relates to Jewish sacrifices and atonements.

The *Dr.* indeed, in the three first paragraphs of his VIIth chapter, has some reflections upon Jewish sacrifices, which are purely imaginary, and without any foundation either in scripture, or common sense. And to those I had drawn up an answer, which I intended to insert in this place. But finding, that it would swell this piece to too large a bulk, and that these reflections did not relate to the nature of Jewish sacrifices, but only to an imaginary dis-

inction of them into political and not-political institutions, and to their reference, or not-reference, to the Abrahamic covenant, and the gospel; I did not think, that the insertion of an answer to them was very material, at least essential to my main purpose: and, therefore, I judged it proper to leave it out, and to proceed to the second part of this work.

The end of the APPENDIX.



PART

P A R T II.

Containing an examination of what Dr. Taylor teaches, in his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined, and in his key to the apostolic writings, concerning the meaning, efficacy, and design of the sacrifice of our blessed Lord, Jesus Christ.

I Do not here propose to examine all that the Dr. has said concerning the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, but only the main and essential parts of his scheme, and the whole scripture-evidence by which he endeavours to support it.—The Dr's whole scheme is reducible to the following heads, *viz.*

I. That the blood or sacrifice, which Christ offered, was the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life.

II. That the sacrifice (*i. e.* the perfect obedience and goodness) of Christ, considered as a moral mean, has a strong and natural tendency to render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient.

III. That because the blood or sacrifice (*i. e.* the perfect obedience and goodness) of Christ hath a natural and strong tendency to render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient, therefore is it a reason with

God, for granting to them the remission or pardon of their sins.

In these three particulars, consists the *Dr's* whole doctrine about the meaning, efficacy, and design of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. And, therefore, I shall examine them severally, in the same order in which I have here placed them.

C H A P. I.

Containing an examination of Dr. Taylor's notion of the blood or sacrifice of Jesus Christ, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; and of the scripture-evidence by which he endeavours to prove and support the truth of it.

§. 1. **I**T appears from many passages in the *Dr's* writings, that he considered the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ's whole life, as being the sacrifice which he offered to God for the sins of mankind. "The blood of Christ, says he, is considered as an offering and sacrifice to God. —How then is this to be understood? *Ans.* The blood of Christ is the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ^a." To the same purpose, "The blood of Christ is precious,—as it is the blood of
" the

^a See Key to the Apostolic writings, Chap. VIII. §. 119, 120.

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 121

“ the *Lamb of God without spot and blemish*;
“ or spotless and unblameable in all duty and
“ obedience to God, and in love and good-
“ ness to men, through the whole course
“ of his life, but especially at his death.
“ This was the sacrifice which he offered to
“ God ^b.” And agreeably to this notion of
the sacrifice of Christ, the *Dr.* often men-
tions the blood of Christ, and his perfect
obedience, righteousness, or holiness, as sy-
nonymous terms, or words of the same sig-
nification. Thus he says, “ The blood of
“ Christ, or his perfect obedience or righ-
“ teousness, makes atonement for sin ^c.”—
“ making intercession for us in virtue of his
“ blood, or perfect holiness, solemnly of-
“ fered or presented before the throne of
“ God ^d.” And accordingly, he calls the
sacrifice which Christ offered, a sacrifice of
real holiness, obedience, and goodness :
“—till Christ came, and offered himself a
“ sacrifice of real holiness, obedience, and
“ goodness ^e.” —But there is no occasion
for multiplying quotations from the *Dr.*'s
writings, to prove that this was his notion of
the sacrifice of Christ, since it is the main
point in his scheme, on which all the
other

^b See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
Chap. X. §. 161.

^c Ibidem, Chap. XI. §. 187.

^d Ibidem, Chap. XI. §. 191.

^e Ibidem, Chap. XI. §. 190.

other parts of it depend, and on the proof of which, by scripture-evidence, he has bestowed much pains. I shall, therefore, proceed directly to an examination of the scripture-evidence by which he has endeavoured to prove and support this point, as it lies before us in the Xth chapter of his *Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined*, and in the second paragraph of the VIIIth chapter of his *Key to the Apostolic writings*.

§. 2. THE *Dr.* introduces his proof of this point in the following words, “—The
 “ word of God gives us much more just
 “ and sublime sentiments; and shews us
 “ that our Lord’s death took its value not
 “ from pain or suffering;—but from obedi-
 “ ence or goodness, or the most complete
 “ character of all virtue and righteousness,
 “ the noblest of all principles, and the
 “ highest perfection of intellectual nature;
 “ and, therefore, of a sweet smelling
 “ savour, or highly pleasing and grateful
 “ to God. This I have proved, and ex-
 “ plained at large, in the VIIIth chapter
 “ of the *Key to the Apostolic writings*,
 “ to which I must refer the reader †.”

A N-

† See *Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined*, Chap. X. §. 160.

ANSWER.

§. 3. THE sentiments, which the word of God gives us of the value of Christ's death, and of that which rendered it highly pleasing and grateful to God, are, doubtless, in themselves, just and noble; and must appear to be so to every intelligent mind, when they are set in a true and proper light. But, I am afraid, the *Dr.* has not hit upon these sentiments in this place.—The death of Christ considered as mere pain or suffering, could be of no value in God's sight, in no degree pleasing and acceptable to him; but, on the contrary, it must have been very odious and offensive to him. We cannot think otherwise, without denying the goodness of the Deity, and conceiving of God as an evil and cruel being, who derives his pleasure and happiness from the pain and misery of other beings. Wherefore, the *Dr.* is in the right, when he says, "Christ's death did not take its value from pain and suffering."—But then he tells us, "That his death took its value from obedience and goodness, or the most complete character of all virtue, and the highest perfection of intellectual nature; and therefore was of a sweet-smelling savour, or highly pleasing and grateful to God." But this, if possible, gives us a more shocking
ing

ing idea of God's nature than the former, as exhibiting him to be a being of a perfectly evil, cruel, and barbarous disposition, to whom the painful and violent death of the most obedient and good being that ever lived, was highly pleasing and grateful; and by whom that death was reckoned valuable, precious, and of great worth, for no other reason, but because it was the death of a person of the highest moral excellence, and whose obedience and goodness were unexceptionable, and, in all respects, perfect. If the violent and ignominious death of a righteous person, of one so eminently righteous as Christ was, be highly pleasing and grateful to God, and that because it is the death of a righteous person, what must become of the goodness and justice of God, or, indeed of his moral character as a being of perfect rectitude? These must all be denied, upon the supposition, that the Deity is capable of being pleased with, or of taking any delight in, the pain and sufferings of a righteous person, because he is a righteous person. But, I think, no more need be said, to expose the absurdity of this horrid principle, which the *Dr.* has adopted. However, to give some light into this affair, I add, that the death of Christ was of the nature of a *mean*; and our redemption from sin was the *end*, or *effect*, which was intended to be accomplished by it, as the scrip-

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 125

scripture every where declares. In this view of things, the death of Christ (like all other *means*) must take its value, in the sight and estimation of God, not from the pain and sufferings which attended it, nor from the obedience and goodness of the sufferer, considered abstractedly in themselves; but from the *end* to which it was subservient, or its fitness and tendency to promote that *end*. The dignity, indeed, of the sufferer, the excellence and perfection of his moral character, and the greatness of the suffering, might be all requisite to constitute the fitness of this *mean*, or to give it a just and due efficacy for accomplishing the end intended, as they, doubtless, were, since the scripture represents them as being all not only concerned, but needful, in the affair. But still, neither one, nor other of these, simply and abstractedly considered, but only as it related to the end intended, and served to constitute the fitness of the mean by which it was to be accomplished, was pleasing and grateful to God. The death of Christ, considered in this view, gives us an high and noble idea of the love and goodness of God, in not sparing his own son, though a person of the highest dignity, and brightest moral excellence, and exceeding dear to himself; but delivering him up to a painful and shameful death, to the end that he might accomplish the work of our redemption, and display

play the perfection of his own moral rectitude, as rector of the universe, in the accomplishment of it. The excellence and goodness of the end did justify the choice of the *mean*, and gave it its whole value. In any other view, the death of Christ will give us a most absurd and shocking idea of the nature of God.

§. 4. AGAIN, supposing that the death of Christ did take its value from his obedience and goodness; yet this, instead of subserving, would really disserve the *Dr's* purpose; because it supposes that the death and the perfect obedience of Christ were two different things. For, if the death of Christ took its value from his obedience and goodness, his death could not be his obedience and goodness: if it had, it could not have derived its value from them. Wherefore, if the *Dr.* could really prove, that the death of Christ did take its whole value from his obedience and goodness, yet this would not prove that the death of Christ was his obedience and goodness, but the contrary.—However the *Dr.* says, that he has “proved this, and explained it at large, “in the VIIIth chapter of the Key to the “Apostolic writings.” And to what he has said there he refers his reader. I shall, therefore, here examine all the scripture-evidence which the *Dr.* has produced, in that VIIIth chapter, to prove this point.
And

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 127

And as the things, which the *Dr.* says in the next paragraph of his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined, coincide with some of these things which he says in that VIIIth chapter of his Key, I shall examine both together.

§. 5. ALL the scripture-evidence, (additional to that which we have in the Xth chapter of his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined,) which the *Dr.* produceth, in the VIIIth chapter of his Key to the Apostolic writings, in order to prove, that Christ's perfect obedience and goodness was the sacrifice which he offered to God for the sins of mankind, is contained in the second paragraph of that chapter. And, therefore, I shall consider and examine all the parts of that paragraph separately and distinctly.

§. 6. THE *Dr.* begins this paragraph with a question, *viz.* "How then is this "
" (*i. e.* the blood or death of Christ, considered as an offering and sacrifice to God) "
" to be understood?" To which he answers, "
" The blood of Christ is the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ." And then he proceeds to the proof of this point; the various parts of which I shall set down in order, and make a particular answer to each of them.

The

The Dr's Proof.

§. 7. I. THE *Dr.* says, " His (Christ's)
 " blood is not to be considered only with
 " regard to the matter of it; for so it is a
 " mere corporeal substance, of no more
 " value in the sight of God than any other
 " thing of the same kind ?

A N S W E R.

§. 8. WHAT the *Dr.* here says, will be readily granted to him : but I don't see that it can be of any service to his scheme. The question, under consideration, is not about the blood of Christ as a corporeal substance, or the value of it in God's sight, as such : but about his voluntary death upon the cross, and its efficacy as a sacrifice for sins : and particularly, about this death as being, or not being, the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life here on earth. And whatever inference the *Dr.* may draw, in support of his scheme, from the blood of Christ, considered as a corporeal substance ; yet, I am persuaded, he can draw none from it, subservient to that purpose, when it is considered in this other view. For, considered as the blood of the Son of God, voluntarily shed upon the cross, or his painful, violent, and shameful death,
 it

it must affect, and make very deep impressions upon, the minds of all sober thinking intelligences, whether God, angels or men.— But supposing that the blood of Christ had been, in all respects, worthless, yet it will not follow, that his blood was his perfect obedience and goodness, or that this is the scripture sense of his blood: if I am not mistaken, the contrary will follow, *viz.* that his blood, because it was of no value, was not his perfect obedience and goodness, which were things of great worth. This last inference, I think, is good common sense; but no way favourable to the *Dr's* notion of the blood or death of Christ.

The Dr's proof continued.

§. 9. II. THE *Dr.* adds, “ Nor is the blood of Christ to be considered only in relation to his death and sufferings, as if mere death or suffering were, in itself, pleasing and acceptable to God.

A N S W E R.

§. 10. WHAT the *Dr.* here means by “ considering the blood of Christ in relation to his death and sufferings,” is what I cannot comprehend. In the scripture phraseology, the blood of Christ, and the death of Christ, are equipollent terms,
K and

and signify one and the same thing: for which reason, his blood cannot be considered in relation to his death, nor his death in relation to his blood. All, therefore, that I can make of what the *Dr.* says, is, the death or suffering of living and sensible beings is not, in itself, pleasing and acceptable to God: consequently, the death or suffering of Christ was not, in itself, pleasing and acceptable to him.—All this is very true. But I cannot see, that it is of any service to the *Dr.* For although the death or suffering of Christ is not, in itself, pleasing and acceptable to God, yet it will not follow, that the blood or death of Christ was the perfect obedience and goodness of his spotless life; or, that this is the scripture-sense of it, which is the point that the *Dr.* has to prove: nor will it follow, that the death or suffering of Christ was pleasing and acceptable to God, because it was the death or suffering of a person whose obedience and goodness were without any stain or defect. If this last was true, the death and sufferings of every obedient and good being would be pleasing and acceptable to God; not only so, but the more perfect the obedience and goodness of any being were, his death and sufferings would, in proportion, be the more pleasing and acceptable to him. A little cool reflection upon these things, may help us to perceive the absurdity of
either

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 131

either making the death of Christ his perfect obedience and goodness, or of conceiving of his perfect obedience and goodness as the things from which his blood or death derived its value in the sight of God. The truth is, the blood or death of Christ was pleasing and acceptable to God, neither in itself, nor on account of his perfect obedience and goodness; but because it was a fit and proper mean for promoting, upon the whole, the happiness of the rational system, particularly, the happiness of penitent sinners, and that in a consistency with their own moral character, the end and rectitude of divine government, and the happiness both of their own species, and of all other rational creatures.

The Dr's Scripture-evidence of this point.

§. 11. III. THE *Dr.* goes on with his proof of this point, in the following words,
“ But his (Christ's) blood implies a character; and it is his blood, as he is a
“ *lamb without spot and blemish*, (1 Pet. i.
“ 19.) that is, as he is perfectly holy,
“ which is of so great value in the sight of
“ God. His blood is the same as his *offer-*
“ *ing himself without spot to God*, Heb. ix.
“ 14.” And to the same purpose, “ The
“ blood of Christ, by which he hath re-
“ deemed us, is precious (1 Pet. i. 18, 19.)

" or of great worth, as it is the blood of
 " the *lamb of God without spot and blemish* ;
 " or spotless and unblameable in all duty
 " and obedience to God, and in love and
 " goodness to men, through the whole
 " course of his life, but principally at his
 " death. This was the sacrifice which he
 " offered to God, (Heb. ix. 14.) and
 " which made atonement for the sin of the
 " world [§]."

A N S W E R.

§. 12. Death is no constituent part of a moral character ; and, therefore, it doth not imply a moral character. Death is the common lot of all men, virtuous or vitious. The moral characters of men, therefore, are no way affected by it. Nor doth blood shed upon, or the violent and painful death of the cross, which was the death that Christ suffered, imply any moral character in the sufferer : for though it was a punishment appointed for certain crimes by the Roman-law ; yet it might be, and, through the iniquity of the times, sometimes actually was, the lot of the innocent and righteous : and, therefore, in itself, it implied no moral character. Considered, indeed,

as

§ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 161.

as a punishment appointed for crimes by the law, it would be generally thought to imply a very immoral character among the Romans, though it did not, in all cases, imply such a character, even among them. But I know of no person, in any age, who ever thought that the death of the cross did imply a character of perfect obedience and goodness, before the *Dr.* took it into his head to think so.

2dly. The *Dr.* affirms that, " It is the blood of Christ, as he is a *lamb without spot and blemish*, that is, as he is perfectly holy, which is of so great value in the sight of God."—This is a most absurd assertion; for the blood of Christ, or his painful and ignominious death, or the violent death of any other righteous person, abstracted from all other considerations but that of the innocency or righteousness of the sufferers, is so far from being of any value in the sight of God, that it is the object of his high displeasure and abhorrence. Instead of having its worth, in his estimation, raised or heightened by the holiness and goodness of the sufferers, it has its odiousness increased and greatly aggravated by them. This, in a clear, demonstrative manner, shews us, that the blood or death of Christ could not take its value in God's sight, from the holiness and goodness of the sufferer.—Besides, had his death really taken

its value from his perfect holiness and goodness, yet this would not prove, that his death and his holiness are one and the same thing: but it would be a clear proof of the contrary; because his death, if it did derive its value from his holiness, must have been a different thing from his holiness; for if it had been the same thing with his holiness, it could not have derived its value from it. So that whether the thing, which the *Dr.* affirms, be true or false, it makes nothing for his purpose.

3dly. The next thing the *Dr.* affirms, is, that "his (Christ's) blood is the same" as his offering himself to God, Heb. ix. "14."—This proposition is manifestly false; because it supposeth an absurdity, *viz.* that the thing offered, and the oblation of it, are the same thing.—Besides, in the place here referred to, the oblation which Christ offered to God, and the moral quality of that oblation, are mentioned as two distinct things. The oblation which he offered to God is described as being *himself*, that is, his own person, or life: and the being without spot is only mentioned as a description of the moral quality of this oblation; and not as being the oblation itself. And in all this I see nothing that makes for the *Dr.*'s purpose.—The Jews, in order to make atonement for their sins, offered, in sacrifice, lambs without spot or blemish, or
lambs

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 135

lambs which had no natural defect or imperfection of body. But should any person take it into his head, to infer from this circumstance, that the blood of these animals, or the oblation of them to God, was the natural perfection of their bodys, he would reason just after the same manner as the *Dr.* must be supposed to do here: but every body must see, that his reasoning would be very absurd and ridiculous.

Lastly. The *Dr.* says, "The blood of
" Christ, by which he hath redeemed us, is
" precious, or of great worth, as it is the
" blood of the lamb of God *without spot*
" *and blemish*, or spotless and unblameable
" in all duty and obedience to God, and in
" love and goodness to men, through the
" whole course of his life, but principally,
" at his death. This was the sacrifice
" which he offered to God, and which
" made atonement for the sin of the world."

—The only argument, subservient to the *Dr's* purpose, that can be formed out of these words, is this:

Christ hath redeemed us by his own blood.

But the blood of Christ is precious, as being the blood of a person eminently and perfectly pious and good.

Therefore, the perfect piety and eminent goodness of Christ, is the blood by which we were redeemed.

This is the only argument for the *Dr's* purpose, that can be formed out of the words before us. But every body must see, that the conclusion of it is wrong drawn: for the only conclusion, that follows from the premises, is this, therefore the blood by which Christ hath redeemed us, is precious blood; a conclusion, which will do nothing for the *Doctor*.

Among the Jews, all lambs that were without spot and blemish, or bodily imperfection, were precious lambs, or lambs of value and worth: but all lambs, that were without spot and blemish, did not make atonement for sin, merely because they were without spot and blemish, or lambs of value and worth: No lambs, however perfect or valuable, ever did, or could do this, unless they were killed, and offered to God in the way appointed by him. The natural perfection of their bodily parts rendered them fit for being offered in sacrifice; but it did not constitute a sacrifice: nothing but their death, and the oblation of them to God in the way prescribed by him, did this. Just so, the perfect piety and goodness of Jesus Christ qualified him for being offered in sacrifice; but they did not constitute that sacrifice of himself which he offered to God for sin; nor could they, of themselves, ever have availed to make atonement for sin, in the way of sacrifice. Nothing could do this,

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 137

this, but the shedding of his blood, the *pouring out his soul to death*, and the offering himself a slain victim to God. Wherefore, no argument can be taken from the consideration of him, as *a lamb without spot and blemish*, to prove, that his perfect obedience and goodness was the blood or sacrifice by which he redeemed us; any more than an argument can be taken from the natural or bodily perfection of lambs in the land of Judea, to prove, that the natural perfection of these lambs, as being *without spot and blemish*, was the sacrifices which made atonement for the sins of the Jews. So that there is nothing of argument in what the *Dr.* here advances.

The Dr's Scripture-evidence continued.

§. 13. IV. To prove that the blood or sacrifice, which Christ offered for sin, was his perfect obedience and goodness, the *Dr.* says further, “ The end of his coming into
“ the world was to *do the will of God*, Heb.
“ x. 7. (John v. 30.—vi. 38.) not to offer
“ figurative or ceremonial sacrifices, but to
“ perform solid and substantial obedience,
“ in all acts of usefulness and beneficence
“ to mankind; by which he became a
“ high-priest after the order of *Melchizedec*,
“ the king of righteousness, and the king of
“ peace or happiness, Heb. vii. 2. And he
“ abode

“*abode in his father's love, or continued to
be the object of his complacency and
delight, because he kept his comandments.*”

A N S W E R.

§. 14. BECAUSE our blessed Lord had received a commandment from the Father, (John x. 18.) *to lay down his life for his sheep*, his laying it down for them, in a voluntary manner, was a solid and substantial act of obedience to his will, or a doing of his will. And it is the doing of the will of God, by this particular act of obedience, and not by the obedience and goodness of his whole life, that is mentioned as an end of his coming into the world, Heb. x. 7. This seems to be very evident from ver. 10. where it is said, *By which will (of God, done by Christ,) we are sanctified, by the offering of the body of Christ once.* This is the scripture account of this affair. But how the *Dr.* or any other person, should be able to infer from it, that the blood, which Christ shed upon the cross to make atonement for sin, was the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life, “in all acts of usefulness and beneficence to mankind;” or, that his perfect obedience and goodness was “the sacrifice which he offered to God for the sin of the world,” is a thing above my comprehension. These,
in

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 139

in my humble opinion, are very wide and wrong consequences. The *Dr.* surely, could not think, that though it was not the end of Christ's coming into the world to offer sacrifices of slain beasts, yet it was not to offer himself, his own soul or life, a sacrifice to God; or that his making his soul, or life, an offering for sin, which was one act of obedience only, was the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; or, that the doing of God's will in one particular, is not a doing of his will, because it is not a doing of it in all things: and yet he must call in one or other of these absurd sentiments to his assistance, before he can make what he advances here, subservient to his purpose.—The only resemblances between Christ and Melchizedec, of which the scripture gives us any account, regard either the double office of king and priest, which they both executed; or their moral qualifications for these offices; or the unchangeableness of their priesthood, in which neither of them had any predecessor or successor; and not the sacrifices which they offered, as the *Dr.* would have it. And, indeed, as it is highly probable, that the sacrifices, which Melchizedec offered, were of the animal kind, there could be no similitude between these sacrifices, and that which Christ offered. We no where read, that Melchizedec offered himself to God a
sacrifice

sacrifice for sin; or that he offered his obedience and righteousness as a sacrifice. And, therefore, if what the *Dr.* says of Jesus Christ, as being, by his perfect righteousness and goodness, “made a priest after the order of Melchizedec,” was really true, (as there is reason to think, it is not,) yet this would make nothing for his purpose.

The *Dr.* adds, “Christ *abode* in his Father’s *love*, or continued to be the object of his complacency and delight, *because he kept his commandments*.”—This is what the scripture affirms, and is very true. But I cannot see, how it can subserve the *Dr.*’s purpose in any imaginable respect. Surely, from Christ’s abiding in his Father’s *love*, *because he kept his commandments*, it will not follow, that his shedding his blood upon the cross, which was one act of obedience only, was all the acts of his obedience, or the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; or even, that the acceptableness of his blood and death to God did depend on the acceptableness of all the other acts of his obedience: for all the acts of his obedience were equally, and on the very same account, acceptable to God, *viz.* because they were acts of obedience to his will. His act of obedience, in dying upon a cross, was as acceptable to God, as any other single act of obedience whatsoever,
for

for no other reason, but because it was an act of obedience.

The Dr's Scripture-evidence continued.

§. 15. V. To prove that the sacrifice of Christ was his perfect obedience and goodness, the *Dr.* proceeds to another topic. "The reason, says he, of his eminence and high distinction is assigned to the perfection and excellence of his moral character, Heb. i. 9. *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* Heb. v. 8, 9. *Though he were a son, yet learned he (yet he was disciplined in) obedience by the things which he suffered: and being thus made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.* Isai. liii. 5. *The chastisement, or discipline, of our peace, which procured our happiness, was upon him.* (מִסַּד *castigatio, eruditio.*) And the apostle, in another place, Phil. ii. 8, 9. shews the true ground of our Lord's being exalted, and made head over all things, as our Redeemer; namely, because he emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, that he might serve mankind in their most important interest; and because in this way, in serving us, he became obedient to death, even the death

" *death of the cross, which was the highest*
 " *instance of obedience, love, and good-*
 " *ness, he could possibly exhibit. For as*
 " *he himself justly observes, (John xv. 13.*
 " *Greater love hath no man than this, that a*
 " *man lay down his life for (to serve) his*
 " *friends. And upon this account it was,*
 " *that the Father loved, and highly exalted,*
 " *him, and blessed us with all the grace*
 " *of the gospel. Thus Christ, gave his life*
 " *a ransom, or atonement, for many. Or,*
 " *in other words, (Eph. v. 2.) Christ hath*
 " *loved us, to such a degree, that he hath*
 " *given himself for us, an offering and a*
 " *sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling sa-*
 " *vour.*"

A N S W E R.

§. 16. HERE we have an argument which
 consists of an antecedent and a consequent.
 The antecedent consists of several texts of
 scripture, which teach us, that Christ's obe-
 dience to God was very eminent, and greatly
 heightened by these sufferings which, in
 obedience to the will of God, he volun-
 tarily and patiently endured, in the execu-
 tion of his mediatorial office; and that this
 eminent obedience of Christ was the basis
 of that great reward which he received
 from the Father, or the reason for which
 God highly exalted him, by conferring uni-
 versal

versal dominion upon him.—This, I think, is the amount of the whole antecedent in the *Dr's* argument.—The consequent of this antecedent is expressed in the following words, “ And upon this account, (*i. e.* on account of his eminent and perfect obedience,) the Father loved, and highly exalted, him, and blessed us with all the “ grace of the gospel.” The first part of this consequent, though it is not an inference from the antecedent, yet it is contained in it; for, in the texts quoted, it is expressly affirmed, that God *loved* and *highly exalted Christ*, because his obedience was so perfect and eminent. But this doth not come up to the *Dr's* purpose; for, because Christ's perfect obedience, being the ground and reason of his exaltation, and his perfect obedience or goodness, being the blood or sacrifice which he offered for sin, are two different things, these texts of scripture, which affirm the one, can be no proof of the truth of the other.—The other part of the *Dr's* consequent, is, that God (on account of Christ's eminent and perfect obedience,) “ hath blessed us with all the “ grace of the gospel.” And this, indeed, comes up to his purpose; because the grant of the remission of sins is one part of the grace of the gospel: and I suppose, that this was the reason, by which the *Dr.* was induced to throw this into the consequent
of

of his argument. However, what entirely precludes him from all benefit from this part of his consequent, is, that it is a false and spurious inference from his antecedent; or, to speak more properly, is no inference at all from it. For, in the texts quoted, there is nothing affirmed, or even implied, suggested or hinted, that gives any countenance to, or ground for such an inference, as every body must see, who will take the pains to read them over with attention.—The *Dr.* concludes his argument in the following words, “Thus *Christ gave his life a ransom*, or
 “*atonement for many*: or in other words,
 “(Eph. v. 2.) *Christ hath loved us* to such a
 “degree, that *he hath given himself for us, an*
 “*offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-*
 “*smelling savour.*” Now, if, by *Christ's giving*
 “*his life a ransom for many*, the *Dr.* means,
 that the life, which *Christ* gave as a ransom
 for them, was his perfect obedience and good-
 ness; this is a point which he has still to
 prove; for the texts, which he has hitherto
 produced, neither affirm nor imply such a
 notion of the sacrifice which *Christ* offered.
 And for the text, which he here quotes from
 Eph. v. 2. it is against him; for it mentions
 nothing about *Christ's* offering up his per-
 fect obedience and goodness, but speaks of
 his giving a very different thing, even *him-*
self, for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God,
for a sweet-smelling savour.

The

The Dr's Scripture-evidence continued.

§. 17. VI. BUT the *Dr.* has something to say, which, he thinks, puts his notion of the sacrifice of Christ out of all doubt. He says, "And to put the matter out of all doubt, the apostle (Rom. v.) expressly affirms, that the grace of God, and his gift to a sinful world, ver. 15. even that free gift which relates to justification not only from the consequence of Adam's one offence, but to the many offences which men have committed, ver. 16. that grace gift which has reference to our reigning in eternal life, ver. 17. He affirms, I say, that this gift and grace is in, by, or through, *the grace of one man Jesus Christ*, [*ἐν Χάριτι τῇ τῷ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου*, ver. 15.] that is to say, through his goodness, love, and benevolence to mankind."

A N S W E R.

§. 18. WHAT the *Dr.* here saith, St. Paul affirms; and, therefore, it must be true. But I cannot see, what he can infer from it, in support of his notion of the sacrifice of Christ, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life. The gift of justification from the consequences of *Adam's* one offence, and of our

L

own

own sins, and that of eternal life, are in, by, or through the goodness, love, and benevolence of Jesus Christ; this is affirmed by both St. Paul and *Dr. Taylor*. Now let us only suppose here, what the scriptures every where affirm, that the gift of these is in, by, or through, one act of the goodness, love, and benevolence of Jesus Christ, *viz.* his love and goodness in dying upon the cross, as a sin-offering or sacrifice; would it not be true upon this supposition, that this gift is in, by, or through, the goodness, love, and benevolence of Jesus Christ; and, at the same time, be true likewise, that this gift is not in, by, or through all those acts of goodness, love, and benevolence, which, put together, made up the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life? Upon this supposition, therefore, (which is the only one the scripture permits us to make in this affair,) all that both St. Paul and *Dr. Taylor* say, is true; and yet the *Dr's* notion of the sacrifice of Christ, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life, is not only not supported, but directly excluded, by it. There is certainly a fallacy in the *Dr's* reasoning here: because it doth not follow, from the gift's being in, by, or through the goodness, love, and benevolence of Jesus Christ, that it was in, by, or through, all his acts of goodness, love, and benevolence: for to render it

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 147

it in, by, or through, his goodness, love, and benevolence, it is sufficient, that it was in, by, or through one act of his goodness, love, and benevolence. What, therefore, the *Dr.* here alledgeth, is no proof of his point.

The Dr's Scripture-evidence continued.

§. 19. VII. To strengthen what he had said, the *Dr.* subjoins, " And he (St. Paul) directs us to conceive, that as Adam's offence and disobedience was the reason or foundation of death's passing upon all mankind; so Christ's righteousness and obedience is the reason or foundation not only of the general restoration to life, but of all other gospel blessings. He considers the offence of the one, and the righteousness of the other, as moral causes of different and opposite effects. For, saith he, ver. 18. *As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience, the many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, the many be made righteous.* 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Ye know the grace (the goodness and love) of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor,*
L 2 " that

148 *Dr. TAYLOR's Sentiments of Part II.*

*"that ye, through his poverty, might be
"rich."*

A N S W E R.

§. 20. IF the *Dr.* by *reason, foundation,* and *moral causes*, meaneth, as I apprehend he doth, motives to, and reasons for, action; *viz.* These motives and reasons by which God was moved and determined to make death, and judgment to condemnation, to pass upon all Adam's posterity, as the punishment of his offence; and righteousness, or justification to life, to pass over to the many, as the consequence or reward of Christ's obedience or righteousness; it doth not appear to me, that St. Paul, in the texts here quoted, either conceived himself, or had any intention to direct us to conceive, that Adam's offence was the reason, foundation, or moral cause, of death's passing upon all mankind; or, that Christ's righteousness or obedience is the reason, foundation, or moral cause, "of a general
"restoration to life, and of all other gospel
"blessings:" for St. Paul says not one word about the motives and reasons by which the Deity was moved and determined to transmit either the one or the other of these to mankind; but only speaks of the means by which they were conveyed to them. All that the Apostle says, in the one case, is,
Death

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 149

Death passed upon all men, all men were made sinners or sufferers, death reigned, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, the many were made sinners or sufferers, by, or through, (not for, or on account of,) the sin of one man, the offence of one, one offence, the disobedience of one man; by, or through, one offence of this one man, as a medium or mean of conveyance; not for it, or on account of it, as a motive to, or reason for, the conveyance of this evil. And all that he says, in the other case, is, The free gift came upon all men to justification of life, the many be made righteous, &c. by, or through, one righteousness, (or act of righteousness;) by, or through, the obedience of one man; by, or through, this one act of righteousness of one man, as a mean of conveyance; and not for it, or on account of it, as a motive to, or reason for, the conveyance of this blessing^b. In this manner doth St. Paul speak

^b In the Greek language, the motives, reasons, or moral causes of actions and effects, are expressed by the preposition *διὰ*, with the accusative case following it; and the way and manner in which, and the means and instruments by which, they are done or produced, are expressed by the same preposition with the Genitive case following it, or by the Dative case following the verb without a preposition. And in this last way, and not in the former, doth St. Paul, in the places referred to, speak of mortality as being the consequence of Adam's sin, and of immortality, or justification

Speak of the offence of Adam, and of the obedience of Christ, in the texts before us. He considers neither of the two as motives, or reasons and moral causes, of actions or effects; but only speaks of the first, as a medium, or mean, in the conveyance of evil; and of the second, as a medium, or mean, in the conveyance of good to mankind. And if the *Dr.* will be pleased to understand what this Apostle saith, according to the genuine sense of his own expressions, he will find nothing in it that is favourable to his notions of the nature and efficacy of Christ's sacrifice. For if the obedience, or righteousness, of Christ, was, as St. Paul represents it, a mean or instrument in the conveyance of the gift of justification, 'tis very plain, that it could not have been a motive or reason with the Deity, for the conveyance or grant of this gift: the reason is, because the mean, in all cases, is chosen for the sake of the end, and not

vice

fication to life, as being the consequence of Christ's obedience. He says, that it was τῷ τῷ ἐνδὲς παραπτώματι, ver. 15, 17. δι' ἐνδὲς παραπτώματος, ver. 18. διὰ τοῦ παραπτώματος τῷ ἐνδὲς, ver. 19. And not διὰ τὸ τῷ ἐνδὲς παραπῶμα, δι' ἐν παραπῶμα, διὰ τὴν παραπῶμα τῷ ἐνδὲς, that the many died, death reigned, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, the many were made sinners. And, in like manner, he says, that it was δι' ἐνδὲς δικαιοσύνης, ver. 18. διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τῷ ἐνδὲς, ver. 19. And not δι' ἐν δικαιοσύμα, διὰ τὴν ὑπακοήν τῷ ἐνδὲς, that the free gift came upon all men to justification of life, and that the many be made righteous.

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 151

vice versa; or, in other words, the end is, in all cases, a reason for the choice of the mean, or means; but the mean, or means, are, in no case, a reason for the choice of the end. But as I shall have this affair to examine to the bottom in my last chapter, I shall say no more about it in this place.

If the *Dr.* should still think, that St. Paul's affirming justification from the consequences of sin, (ver. 18, 19.) to be by, or through, the righteousness or obedience of Christ, is favourable to his notion of the sacrifice of Christ, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; it may be observed, that this apostle, in one of these verses, (*viz.* ver. 18.) cautions us against thus understanding him, by calling the obedience of Christ, by, or through, which we are justified, or made righteous, *one righteousness*, or one act of righteousness, or righteous act, and that as standing in contrast, with that *one offence*, or one act of offence, of *Adam*, by, or through, which judgment came upon all men to condemnation: for he says, *As by one offence*, (*δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος*,) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; so by one righteousness, (*δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοσύνης*, by one righteous act,) the free gift came upon all men to justification of life¹. And as it is St. Paul's design in the context,

L 4

as

¹ See Mr. Locke in locum.

as well as in this verse, to exhibit the contrast between one offensive act of *Adam* and the consequences of it to mankind, and one righteous act of *Christ* and the consequences of it to mankind, he must, when he mentions the obedience or righteousness of *Christ* without any restriction, be understood to speak of one act of obedience, or one righteous act only; for if he is not so understood, the contrast, which he is exhibiting, will be lost. And I sincerely wish that the *Dr.* as he has taken notice of this interpretation, in his notes upon ver. 18. had paid a greater regard to it, because it is a dead weight upon that interpretation which supports his notion of the sacrifice of *Christ*, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life.

The last text the *Dr.* mentions, as having something in it for his purpose, is, 2 Cor. viii. 9. *Ye know the grace (the goodness and love) of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might be rich.*—The thing which the apostle speaks of in these words, is, the poor and indigent state of life, in which *Christ* was graciously pleased to be placed here on earth, for the good and benefit of mankind. This is the thing which he expressly mentions; and the only thing which the nature and scope of his discourse required to be mentioned. But he

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 153

he doth not say one word about the sacrifice of Christ, or about its nature and efficacy. If the *Dr.* thinks he doth; he hath it to prove. And till he has proved it, I must be allowed to think, that this text makes nothing for his purpose.

The conclusion of the Dr's Scripture-evidence.

§. 21. THE *Dr.* concludes this long paragraph of scripture-evidence in the following words, "From all this, it appears, that
" the *blood of Christ*, or that by which he
" has bought and redeemed us, is his love
" and goodness to men, and his obedience
" to God, exercised indeed through the
" whole course of his humiliation in this
" world, but most eminently exhibited in
" his death. *His blood is precious*, (1 Pet.
" i. 19.) And it is precious, not in the sense
" in which silver and gold, or any other
" material thing, is precious, but as it is the
" blood of a *lamb without spot and blemish* :
" that is to say, it is his compleat and spot-
" less righteousness, his humility, goodness,
" and obedience to death, which makes his
" blood precious in the best and highest
" sense, and gives his cross all its worth and
" efficacy.

A N-

ANSWER.

§. 22. IN what respects the blood of Christ is precious; and from what it derives its value or worth, I have considered already^k; and have nothing further to add, on that head, in this place. And for the rest; the whole proof, which the *Dr.* has brought from the scripture, in support of that notion of the sacrifice of Christ which he here gives us, has been minutely considered; and, upon the strictest examination, it has been found, I think, that no one part of it amounts to a good proof, or even the shadow of a proof, of the truth of it.

§. 23. HAVING thus dispatched the examination of all the scripture-evidence, which the *Dr.* has produced, in the VIIIth chapter of his *Key to the Apostolic writings*, of his notion of Christ's sacrifice, as being the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; I now proceed to examine his scripture illustrations of it, as they lie before us in the Xth chapter of his *Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined*.

§. 24. THESE scripture-illustrations are of the analogical kind; a species of illustration, which, though pretty well calculated to confound, and stop the mouth of an opponent, has been so far from being of any great

^k See this same section, §. 2—12. inclusive.

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 155

great service in explaining and proving scripture-doctrines, that it has often obscured, and not seldom misrepresented them. If any person wants to have an instance of these dangerous effects of analogical illustrations, he may turn over to that part of the late learned and worthy bishop of Durham's Book of Analogy, which relates to the atonement, or sacrifice, of Jesus Christ; where he will see, what havock may be made both of scripture-doctrine and common-sense, by the mere force of analogys. And, I am afraid, that the *Dr's* analogical illustrations will not, upon trial, be found to have a much better effect upon the scripture-doctrine concerning that point. But let us proceed to the examination of them.

The Dr's Scripture-illustrations.

§. 25. THE *Dr.* after having said, that Christ's perfect obedience and goodness
" was the sacrifice which he offered to
" God, and which made atonement for the
" sin of the world," subjoins,—So the obedience of Abraham was a reason for bestowing blessings upon his posterity, Gen. xxii. 16—18.—xxvi. 4, 5. So Moses, and other good men, averted the judgments of God by their prayers and righteousness, Exod. xxxii. 30—32.
" Numb.

“ Numb. xiv. 20. 1 Sam. vii. 8—10. Job
 “ xlii. 7, 8. Jer. xv. 1. Ezek. xiv. 13—20.
 “ So Phineas, by executing an act of justice,
 “ turned away the wrath of God from the
 “ children of Israel, Numb. xxv. 11—
 “ 13¹.”

A N S W E R.

§. 26. BETWEEN the nature of the cases here mentioned, and that of sacrifices, there is such a dissimilarity, that no argument can be taken from the one to illustrate the other. The obedience of Abraham was, indeed, a medium by which blessings were conveyed to his posterity, and, perhaps, a reason for the conveyance of them: but then his obedience was no sacrifice; nor is it any where said, that it made atonement for the sins of his posterity, or that it procured the remission of sin for any one of them. And, therefore, no argument can be taken from the efficacy and effect of Abraham's obedience to illustrate the nature, efficacy, and effect of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.—In like manner, the prayers and righteousness of Moses and other good men, and an act of justice executed by Phineas, were the means of averting the wrath and judgments of

¹ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 162.

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 157

of God from other persons: and they are actually said to have atoned, or made atonement, for their sins: but then, these prayers and acts of righteousness of Moses and other good men, and the act of justice which was executed by Phineas, were not sacrifices; and the atonements, which were made by them, as the *Dr.* very well observes, were extra-levitical, and such as had *no relation to sacrifices*^m.—Not to enlarge here; before the *Dr.* can make any of the cases, here alledged, subservient to his purpose, he must prove two things, which I despair of ever seeing proved. He must prove, (1.) that prayer, acts of righteousness, justice, and virtue, are true and proper sacrifices. And, (2.) that the sacrifice, which Christ offered, was the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life.—The proof of the last of these the *Dr.* has attempted, and has, I think, altogether failed in the attempt. And for the first, instead of proving it, he hath overthrown it by his very definitions of sacrifice, by which he makes sacrifices to be, not prayer, nor acts of righteousness, justice, and virtue; but symbols or emblems of prayer and praise, and of the internal desires, affections, dispositions, and virtues of the mind.

Upon

^m See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. V. §. 70. and Chap. VI. §. 107.

Upon the whole, since, in all the cases here produced by the *Dr.*, the means, by which the effects were produced, were not sacrifices, but things of a different nature; and since, withal, the effect, in one of these cases, was not the remission of sin, but a different one; I may, I think, venture to conclude, that the *Dr.*'s notions of the nature and efficacy of Christ's sacrifice can receive no illustration, in the way of analogical reasoning, from any of these cases.

The Dr's Scripture illustrations continued.

§. 27. THE *Dr.* adds, "And that the
 " scriptural notion of atonement will fairly
 " admit this way of accounting for our re-
 " demption by Christ, he that hath care-
 " fully perused the foregoing examination of
 " the scriptural-sense of atonement, will, I
 " think, be convinced. For if, in various
 " instances, the virtue, piety, and prayers
 " of good men, were the reason of God's
 " bestowing pardon, and sundry blessings,
 " upon others; how much more must the
 " perfect righteousness and goodness of the
 " son of God, be a reason for remitting the
 " sins of mankind?"

A N-

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 163.

A N S W E R.

§. 28. WITH the utmost care, have I read over and examined the *Dr's* examination of the scriptural-sense of extra-levitical atonements; and yet can receive no light from it, concerning the scripture-sense of Levitical or sacrificial atonements. And till the *Dr.* has cleared up the scriptural-sense of the last mentioned atonements, (which he has neither done, nor attempted to do, as I have before shewn,) his way of accounting for our redemption by Christ cannot, in reason, be admitted. Till this is done, 'tis impossible to know, what the scriptural-sense of sacrificial atonement is; or whether, it will, or will not, admit that way of accounting for our redemption by the sacrifice of Christ.—The *Dr.* indeed, has clearly proved, that the pardon of sin, and sundry other blessings, have been procured for other persons by extra-levitical atonements, that is, by the prayers, piety, and virtue of good men. But pray, what is this to his purpose? Were the prayers, piety, and virtue, by which these blessings were procured, true and proper sacrifices? The *Dr.* himself, by making sacrifices the symbols or emblems of them, and by acknowledging that the atonements, which were made by them, had no relation to sacrifices, declares that

that they were not. Or can it be thought, that symbols and mere-shadows could have the same efficacy, and produce the same effect, as the substance itself? this is shocking to common sense. Or did sacrificial atonements, under the law of Moses, like extra-levitical atonements, procure blessings for any persons but the offerers? This, I presume, will not be affirmed. As far, therefore, as I can yet see, the scriptural-sense of extra-levitical atonements affords us no light at all about the scriptural sense, or the nature and efficacy of Jewish sacrifices; and still less, if possible, about the nature, efficacy, and scriptural sense, of the sacrifice of Christ, by which we are redeemed. This last mentioned sacrifice, though offered by one whose obedience and goodness were perfect, yet, if we will believe the scriptures, it was not his perfect obedience and goodness, but death voluntarily chosen and submitted to, blood shed upon the cross, and offered to make atonement for the sins of mankind. How then should the nature and efficacy of this sacrifice admit the same way of being accounted for, as those of extra-levitical atonements, which were made by different means, such as prayer, and acts of piety, and virtue?

§. 29. HAVING now finished my examination of the *Dr's* scripture-evidence, and scripture-illustrations, of his notion of the sacrifice

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 161

sacrifice of Christ, as being his perfect obedience and goodness; I shall, before I conclude this head, subjoin one general remark upon this notion of the *Dr.* with some illustrations of the truth of it.—The remark is this, that it will be very difficult, impossible, I think, to reconcile the *Dr.*'s notion of the sacrifice of Christ, with the current phraseology of the holy scriptures; or with his own notion of Jewish sacrifices, which, most certainly, were true and proper sacrifices; and must, for that very reason, agree, in the general nature of sacrifice, with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, provided it was a true and proper sacrifice, as there is good reason to think, it was.

§. 30. I. THIS notion of the sacrifice of Christ cannot, I think, be brought to accord with the scripture-phraseology. The scriptures always speak of this sacrifice as being the death of Christ; as being his blood, the shedding of his blood, his cross, his being made a curse by hanging on a tree, his giving, or laying down, his life, his offering himself (not his actions) an offering and a sacrifice, &c. But they never once mention his perfect obedience and goodness, as being the sacrifice which he offered to God.—If it be urged here, that we must understand these scripture-phrases in the *Dr.*'s way, or we cannot make the doctrine, which is grounded upon them in the scrip-

M

ture,

ture, consistent with reason and common sense. I answer; this objection supposes, and takes for granted, that which ought to be clearly proved, *viz.* that the doctrine, grounded upon the death or sacrifice of Christ, is inconsistent with reason and common sense, unless his death or sacrifice be understood to signify his perfect obedience and goodness. But this should be fairly proved, before the truth of it is admitted. One thing seems to be pretty clear, *viz.* that the scripture-phrases, now mentioned, cannot be understood in the *Dr's* sense, without the most violent and unnatural straining, a departure from the obvious sense of the words, and the putting a sense upon them in which they are not to be found in any writing. Withal, if any person should understand them in this sense, he would still have it to prove from scripture, that they ought to be so understood; which, I am of opinion, will never be proved, unless it be by a proof of the same kind with that of the *Dr*, which, as we have seen, is no proof at all.

§. 31. II. THE *Dr's* notion of the sacrifice of Christ cannot be brought to agree, in its nature, as a sacrifice, with his notion of Jewish, piacular-sacrifices. His notion of the last mentioned sacrifices, is, that they were symbols of the penitence and penitent address of those by whom they were offered.

But

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 163

But the sacrifice of Christ, according to him, was neither the penitence nor penitent address of the offenders for whom it was offered, nor the symbol of them; but a quite different thing, even the perfect obedience and goodness of the whole life of another person. In the one case, atonement was made for sin by the symbolical, penitent address of the offender himself: In the other, it was made by the perfect obedience and goodness of the priest who offered the sacrifice. And how two species of things, which agree in nothing, should yet agree in the general nature of sacrifice, is what I cannot comprehend.

§. 32. THE *Dr.* indeed, tells us, "That
" the virtue and efficacy of Jewish sacrifices
" (in their inferior kind and degree, as
" types, figures, and emblems,) coincide
" with the virtue and efficacy of Christ's
" sacrifice."—ANSW. The virtue and efficacy of Jewish-sacrifices, considered as types, figures, and emblems, cannot, in any kind or degree, coincide with the virtue and efficacy of what the *Dr.* calls Christ's sacrifice, *viz.* his perfect obedience and goodness; because they were things of a very dissimilar nature and efficacy. Types, figures, and emblems, considered in them-

M 2

selves,

° See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
Chap. XI. §. 190.

selves, have no virtue or efficacy, can do nothing, can produce no manner of effect: considered even in reference to the things which they represent, they have no efficacy, but only as they serve to excite the ideas of these things, and to occasion thoughts and meditations about them; which is a very different efficacy from what the things themselves have. Yea, the Jewish-sacrifices, considered even as types, figures, and emblems, of what the *Dr.* calls, "the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ," cannot coincide, either in the same kind, or in any degree, of efficacy, with this latter sacrifice. To suppose that they did, would be the same thing as to suppose, that a shadow of a thing has the same kind of efficacy, or some degree of the same efficacy, as the substance; or that the print or draught of a corn-mill has the same kind of efficacy, or some degree of the same kind of efficacy, as a real corn-mill.

§. 33. BUT in order to support the coincidence between the efficacy of Jewish-sacrifices and that of the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, the *Dr.* subjoins, "They (*i. e.* the Jewish-sacrifices) were symbolical instructions in holiness, till Christ came, and offered up himself a sacrifice of real holiness, obedience, and goodness, to instruct us in a

" more

“ more perfect manner ^p.”—ANSW. All the institutions and external dutys of religion must, as such, agree in a general tendency to instruct men in holiness, and promote piety; for unless each of them had this tendency, they could not be religious institutions and dutys. But though all the institutions and external dutys of religion do, and must, agree in this general tendency; yet, to infer from their agreement in it, (as the *Dr.* seems to do, in the case before us,) that all the institutions and external dutys of religion are of one species, or, that the virtue and efficacy which each of them has in producing its peculiar and appropriated effect, is the same kind of virtue and efficacy, would be to reason, not only in a wrong, but in a very strange and wild manner. Wherefore, supposing both Jewish-sacrifices, and the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, as the *Dr.* calls it, to have agreed, as instructions in holiness, in the same general tendency with one another, and all other institutions of religion; yet, it will not follow, that the virtue or efficacy of Jewish-sacrifices, and of this sacrifice of Christ, is of the same nature and kind; any more than it will follow, that the virtue or efficacy of circumcision, or of eating the

M 3

Lord's-

^p See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. XI. §. 190.

Lord's-supper, because they agree in the same general tendency with sacrifices, is of the same nature and kind with the virtue and efficacy of sacrifices. If the *Dr.* would prove this point of his to purpose, he must bring his arguments from other topics, than that of the agreement of Jewish-sacrifices, and of the sacrifice of Christ; in such a general tendency, virtue, or efficacy, as is not peculiar to them as sacrifices, but belongs, in common, to all other institutions of religion, as well as to them.

§. 34. I acknowledge, that the sacrifice of Christ made atonement for sins, and that the atonement, which it made for them, was extra-levitical. I acknowledge, likewise, that the means, by which some extra-levitical atonements were made, were acts of piety, such as prayer, acts of righteousness, the execution of justice upon offenders. But if any person should infer from these concessions, that the mean, by which Christ made atonement for sin, was of the same nature and kind with those by which these other extra-levitical atonements were made for sin, *viz.* acts of piety, or the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; and, consequently, that his perfect obedience and goodness were the sacrifice which he offered to God: I say, if any such argument as this should be grounded upon the concessions mentioned, the *Dr.*
supplies

Chap. I. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 167

supplies us with a very proper and satisfactory answer to it, *viz.* that extra-levitical atonements were such as “ had no relation “ to sacrifices^{*}.” Wherefore, if atonement was made for sins, by the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, after the same manner as some other extra-levitical atonements were made for sins, by acts of piety; and if these other extra-levitical atonements were made, not by sacrifice, but by other means, which had no relation to sacrifice; then, it plainly follows, that the atonement, which Christ made for sins by his perfect obedience and goodness, was not made by sacrifice, but by such a mean, as had no relation to sacrifice: consequently, that his perfect obedience and goodness, by which he made this atonement, were no sacrifice.

To conclude; if that idea of piacular sacrifice, which the *Dr.* exhibits in his definitions of Jewish-sacrifices, be a true and just one; that which he gives us of the sacrifice of Christ must be a wrong one. Either the one or the other of these ideas of sacrifice must be a false one; for it is impossible that both of them should be true ideas of things of the same kind and species,

M 4

(such

* See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. V. §. 70. Also the first part of this my examination of it, Chap. II. §. 33.

(such as all piacular-sacrifices are,) because they are ideas of things of a different nature and kind. As far as I can judge, both these ideas are wrong ideas of sacrifice. I wish the *Dr.* had been pleased to give us a definition of piacular-sacrifice, such as had been equally applicable to Jewish piacular-sacrifices, and to that of Christ. For the omission of this leaves his reader in the dark, and his own whole doctrine about sacrifices in disorder and confusion. But I go on to

C H A P. II.

Containing an examination of the tendency which the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, as it stands in Dr. Taylor's scheme, has to promote sanctification, or to render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient.

§. 1. **T**HE next constituent part of the *Dr's* scheme of redemption, is, that the death of Christ (*i. e.* his perfect obedience and goodness) hath a strong and natural tendency, as a moral mean, to promote our sanctification, or to render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient. This principle he not only adopts, but bestows much pains upon the proof of it^a.

§. 2.

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Attonement examined, Chap. X. §. 168—171. and Chap. XI. throughout.

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 169

§. 2. IN the foregoing chapter, it has been proved, that the death or sacrifice of Christ was not his perfect obedience and goodness; and that all the scripture-evidence, which the *Dr.* has produced to prove the contrary, is weak and inconclusive. Wherefore, though the *Dr.* really could prove, (as, indeed, he has done,) that the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ has a strong and natural tendency to promote our sanctification; yet it would not follow, that the death or sacrifice of Christ (which is a thing of a different nature) has any natural tendency to promote our sanctification; which is the point that he has to prove. And upon this I might rest my whole answer to all that the *Dr.* has said, in order to prove that the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, as he is pleased to call it, has a strong and natural tendency, as a moral mean, to promote our sanctification. But since it may be useful and profitable, to penetrate to the very bottom of the *Dr.*'s scheme of redemption, and to lay open the weakness of its foundation, I shall here bestow a more particular examination upon this part of it.

§. 3. I acknowledge, that the death or sacrifice of Christ is often mentioned in the scriptures both as a perfect pattern of all piety and virtue, and as a most powerful motive to the practice of them; consequently,

ly, as a mean of our sanctification. This is abundantly clear from a good number of of these texts which the *Dr.* has quoted in the XIth chapter of his scripture-doctrine of atonement examined. And for this reason, the death or sacrifice of Christ, as it stands in the true scripture-scheme of redemption, must have a strong and natural tendency to promote our sanctification, and to render men, who are corrupt, and wicked, penitent and obedient.

§. 4. BUT as the best things may be perverted, and made to subserve bad purposes; so the death or sacrifice of Christ, may be so placed and circumstanced, in an unscriptural scheme of redemption, that its tendency to our sanctification shall not only be overruled, and set aside, but a contrary tendency be given to it, whereby it shall become a most powerful motive and encouragement to the practice of sin and wickedness, and a mean of corrupting mankind. Unscriptural schemes of redemption of this bad tendency, have not only been set on foot, but become very popular. And whether the *Dr's* scheme is, or is not, a scheme of this bad tendency, is what I now propose to examine.

§. 5. IN order to discover whether the death of Christ, as it stands in the *Dr's* scheme, has a natural tendency to reform mankind, or to corrupt them, we must take his notion of the death of Christ along with

us ;

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 171

us ; together with the other things with which he has connected it, in his scheme of redemption, as followeth ;

First. By the death or sacrifice of Christ, the *Dr.* understands the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life, here on earth ; as we have seen already.

Secondly. He makes the death of Christ, or his perfect obedience and goodness, to be the reason of the remission of sins, or a reason with God, for granting the remission of them ; of which we have had several hints already ; and we shall see more to the same purpose, in the next chapter.

Thirdly. The remission of sins, for the grant of which the *Dr.* makes the death of Christ, or his perfect obedience and goodness, a reason with God, is an absolute and full remission of them, consisting in a full discharge from death and every penal evil. For he calls it, a full and eternal redemption^b ; salvation in the most perfect kind, and highest degree^c ; a general pardon^d ; an exemption from punishment, and a new and glorious state of being in eternal life^e ; remission of sin, in a full discharge from death, and every penal evil, and the gift of eternal

^b See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. XI. §. 190.

^c Ibidem, Chap. VIII. §. 142.

^d Ibidem, Chap. VII. §. 123.

^e Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 160.

nal life.^f Hence it clearly appears, that the remission of sins, for the grant of which the *Dr.* makes the death, or the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, a reason with God, includes an absolute and full discharge from all punishment, in connection with the gift of eternal life, or a glorious and happy state in eternal life.

Fourthly. The *Dr.* considers this absolute and full remission of sins as being obtainable, upon repentance, at any time, even in *articulo mortis*. This is evident from his saying, "That a penitent sinner (without any limitation of time,) is in the fittest state to receive pardon; and that God is readily disposed to forgive those who truly repent, and turn from their evil ways^g:" and from his affirming, "that, in the gospel, repentance is (universally, and without any limitation of time) made available not only to exempt from punishment, but to gain a new and glorious state of being in eternal life^h;" and from his making the sacrifice of Christ, or his perfect obedience and righteousness, "the foundation of a general pardon, at all times, upon repentanceⁱ."

Where-

^f See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VII. §. 124.

^g Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 165.

^h Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 166.

ⁱ Ibidem, Chap. VII. §. 123, 124.

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 173

Wherefore, putting all these particulars together, it appears, that the *Dr.* considers the sacrifice of Christ, or his perfect obedience and goodness, as being a reason with God, for granting to all sinners an absolute, full, and entire pardon of all their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, whether it be sooner or later; and, consequently, as furnishing every sinner with a previous hope and assurance, of such a pardon of his sins, at what time soever he repents of them. This I take to be the true and only view in which the sacrifice of Christ (or his perfect obedience and goodness) is placed by the *Dr.* in his scheme of redemption. And, I presume, that I have not misrepresented his sentiments.

§. 6. Now the query, to be considered and discussed here, is, whether the death of Christ, or his perfect obedience and righteousness, as thus furnishing men, in their present state of depravation, or moral corruption, with a previous hope and assurance of an absolute and full pardon of all their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, whether it be sooner or later, has a natural and strong tendency to their sanctification, or to render them penitent and obedient; or, whether it has not rather a natural and strong tendency to encourage and harden them in the practice of vice and disobedience, and to corrupt them more
and

nal life.^f Hence it clearly appears, that the remission of sins, for the grant of which the *Dr.* makes the death, or the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, a reason with God, includes an absolute and full discharge from all punishment, in connection with the gift of eternal life, or a glorious and happy state in eternal life.

Fourthly. The *Dr.* considers this absolute and full remission of sins as being obtainable, upon repentance, at any time, even in *articulo mortis*. This is evident from his saying, "That a penitent sinner (without
" any limitation of time,) is in the fittest
" state to receive pardon; and that God is
" readily disposed to forgive those who truly
" repent, and turn from their evil ways^g;" and from his affirming, "that, in the gospel,
" repentance is (universally, and without any
" limitation of time) made available not only
" to exempt from punishment, but to gain
" a new and glorious state of being in eternal life^h;" and from his making the sacrifice of Christ, or his perfect obedience and righteousness, "the foundation of a general pardon, at all times, upon repentanceⁱ."

Where-

^f See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VII. §. 124.

^g Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 165.

^h Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 166.

ⁱ Ibidem, Chap. VII. §. 123, 124.

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 173

Wherefore, putting all these particulars together, it appears, that the *Dr.* considers the sacrifice of Christ, or his perfect obedience and goodness, as being a reason with God, for granting to all sinners an absolute, full, and entire pardon of all their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, whether it be sooner or later; and, consequently, as furnishing every sinner with a previous hope and assurance, of such a pardon of his sins, at what time soever he repents of them. This I take to be the true and only view in which the sacrifice of Christ (or his perfect obedience and goodness) is placed by the *Dr.* in his scheme of redemption. And, I presume, that I have not misrepresented his sentiments.

§. 6. Now the query, to be considered and discussed here, is, whether the death of Christ, or his perfect obedience and righteousness, as thus furnishing men, in their present state of depravation, or moral corruption, with a previous hope and assurance of an absolute and full pardon of all their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, whether it be sooner or later, has a natural and strong tendency to their sanctification, or to render them penitent and obedient; or, whether it has not rather a natural and strong tendency to encourage and harden them in the practice of vice and disobedience, and to corrupt them more
and

and more? And here, I hesitate not one moment to pronounce, that the death or sacrifice of Christ (even supposing it was his perfect obedience and goodness) would, in the circumstances mentioned, have the latter, and not the former tendency.

§. 7. We don't find, that any previous hope or assurance of pardon, much less of a full and entire pardon, was afforded to our first parents in their state of innocency. And why was this withheld from them? for no reason, that we can form any conception of, but only this, because the grant of it would have been an encouragement to sin and disobedience, and the mean of seducing them from their innocency. When the piety and virtue, even of an innocent creature, are brought upon trial, by appetites and passions strongly and unduly raised by any objects, a previous hope or assurance of a full pardon upon repentance, at any time performed, must greatly lessen, and even quite remove, his apprehension of danger, and fear of punishment; and make him think, without thinking much amiss, that he may indulge and gratify his headstrong appetites and passions for the present, and yet secure himself against all future punishment by a subsequent repentance. And this removal of the fear of punishment, by the hope of impunity, must, in the very nature of the thing, weaken his piety and
virtue,

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 175

virtue, and constitute such a strong motive and encouragement to acts of disobedience, as can scarce fail to seduce him from his innocency. This is the effect which a previous hope and assurance of full and absolute pardon, upon repentance, would naturally have upon the moral temper and behaviour even of an innocent creature. Instead of having any tendency to secure his piety and obedience; it would have a direct and natural tendency to corrupt his mind, and to render him wicked and disobedient: for, as an elegant writer, very well acquainted with human nature, observes, "Give a
" man power of doing what he pleases with
" impunity, you extinguish his fear; and,
" consequently, over-turn in him one of
" the great pillars of morality *.

§. 8. A previous hope and assurance of full and absolute pardon, upon repentance at any time performed, must have a still worse influence upon the moral temper and behaviour of men who are, before hand, corrupted with a love of sin and vice. This is what may naturally be expected from the prevailing bent and bias of a corrupt mind, the undue strength of its appetites and passions, and the vicious dispositions and habits which it has acquired, and by which it is rendered extremely susceptible of, and prepared

* Spectator No. 287.

pared to yield to all these impressions which are made upon it, by the several incitements to vice and disobedience. This natural tendency which the prospect of full pardon, upon repentance, at any time performed, has to corrupt the minds and morals of mankind, is acknowledged by the *Dr.* himself, who says, "Easy, indiscreet pardons may
 " give encouragement to transgression ; and
 " forgiveness, lightly obtained, may give
 " a light opinion of wickedness, not only
 " to the offender himself, but to all his fellow-subjects." For which reason, he tells us, " that the Deity ought to guard,
 " qualify, and circumstance his pardons in
 " in such manner, as not to propagate, but,
 " if possible, to extirpate a spirit of disorder and rebellion ;—and that pardon
 " cannot be wisely and reasonably dispensed
 " in any other way ; how merciful soever
 " the governour be, or how penitent soever the criminal¹." And what the *Dr.* thus acknowledges, and reason and common-sense dictate, experience and observation confirm. What is it that is seen, in the way of common observation, or that is felt in the experience of all individuals, to be the main, constant, and inexhaustible fountain of sin and disobedience ? Is it not the prospect

¹ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 165.

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 177

prospect and hope of absolute and full pardon, upon repentance, at any time performed? Is it not this, which, from time to time, encourages the wicked to persevere in a course of disobedience and impenitency, and even, in a manner irremediable, hardens them in it? And is it not the pernicious influence of the same hope, that so frequently enervates the good purposes and resolutions even of the penitent and righteous, and seduces them into the practice of known sin? In a word, is it not this hope of an absolute and full pardon, raised and kept up in the minds of people by the doctrines and systems of men, that is the general encouragement to all manner of vice, and the main source of that universal corruption of manners which has spread itself among mankind? most certainly it is. And, I am afraid, that the evil effects of this dangerous and ensnaring hope will never be removed, till the dictates of right reason, and the doctrines of revelation, in relation to the pardon of the penitent, are more thoroughly searched out, better understood, and exhibited in a light different from that in which they are commonly and usually placed at present; such a light as may convince men, that they can neither remain, for any time, in a course of wilful disobedience and impenitency, nor commit any one wilful sin, without rendering their state so much

N

the

the worse, in proportion, by so doing; and that, in a manner not remediable by repentance, nor by any other means.

§. 9. BUT the *Dr.* thinks, that these ill effects upon the moral temper and behaviour of men, which would, otherwise, naturally arise from a previous hope or assurance of absolute and full pardon, upon repentance, at any time performed, are duly and properly guarded against by the sacrifice of Christ, or the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life; and that, because this sacrifice, as it is a reason with God for granting full and absolute pardon to the sinner, at what time soever he repents, "so it has a natural" and strong tendency, as a moral mean, to "render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient^m." But in this, I think, the *Dr.* is mistaken: for the sacrifice, or perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, (whatever tendency it may have to render men penitent and obedient, when placed in a different view, yet) in the view in which it is placed in his scheme, that is, as being a reason with God to grant unto sinners a full and absolute pardon of their sins, at what time soever they repent of them; and even to furnish them with the hope of such a pardon, not only before they have repented

of

^m See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 168—171.

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 179

of their sins, but before they have committed them ; I say, the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, considered in this view, must have a natural and strong tendency to harden men in sin, and to corrupt them more and more, as removing all fear of punishment at the very time they are committing sin, or resolving to commit it. More particularly.

§. 10. *First.* THE perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, as supplying all men, both penitent and impenitent, even at the very time they are offending, with the hope not only of a discharge from the punishment of the impenitent, but of a full and absolute pardon, upon repentance, at any time performed, must have a very ill effect upon the morals of mankind. It must have a natural and strong tendency not only to remove all apprehension of danger, and fear of punishment, at the very time they are offending ; but even to raise in them the hope of being able to enjoy all the pleasures and emoluments of wickedness for the present, and to ward off all punishment by repentance, to be performed, some time or other, afterwards. And when the fear of all punishment is thus removed, and the hope of absolute impunity supplied ; what possibly can there remain, that can be deemed sufficient, to deter men, corrupt and wicked, from any sin or act of disobedience?

ence? the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, considered as being a reason with God for granting full and absolute pardon, upon repentance, performed at any time of life, can have no influence this way, but must have a contrary tendency; because, by enabling men to enjoy the pleasures and emoluments of a vicious life for the present, with the hope of full pardon and impunity, to be secured, sooner or later, by repentance; it must prove a direct and great encouragement to the practice of sin, and a mean of rendering men easy and secure in the commission of it.

§. 11. *Secondly.* THE perfect obedience and goodness of Christ, considered as being a reason with God, additional to the motive which arises from the innate goodness and mercy of his own nature, for granting a full and absolute pardon, upon repentance, performed at any time of life, must have a still worse influence upon the morals of wicked and corrupt men. For, considered in this view, they have no tendency, but only to heighten and strengthen such a hope of entire impunity, upon a late repentance, as must remove all fear of punishment for the present, and be an encouragement to the practice of vice and wickedness.

§. 12. FROM these considerations, 'tis evident, I think, that the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, as they stand,
and

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 181

and are circumstanced, in the *Dr.*'s scheme of redemption, instead of having any real tendency to render men, that are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient; have a strong and natural tendency to encourage and harden them in the practice of sin, and to render them more and more corrupt.

§. 13. BUT the *Dr.* is still of opinion, that the sacrifice of the perfect obedience of Christ, as he is pleased to call it, has a natural and strong tendency, in several respects, to render men, who are corrupt and wicked, penitent and obedient; particularly, as being performed by a person dear to God, and of the highest dignity; as being a most astonishing instance of the great love of God, and of his beloved son, to mankind; and withal, as being, in itself, a perfect and admirable pattern of piety and goodness, an exhibition of the vast worth and importance of them; and carried to the highest pitch of perfection, through a course of deep humiliation, trials of all sorts, the most painful and ignominious sufferings, all issuing, at last, in a voluntary submission to the shameful and violent death of the cross, for the good of mankindⁿ.

§. 14. Now, that the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, as they stand

N 3

in

ⁿ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 169, 170.

in the true Gospel-scheme of redemption, have, in all the respects here mentioned, a natural tendency to render sinners penitent and obedient, is what the scriptures of the New-Testament expressly affirm; and, therefore, there can be no ground for any doubt or dispute about the truth of it among christians. But whether the perfect obedience and goodness of Jesus Christ, as they stand in the *Dr's* scheme of redemption, (that is, as they are a sacrifice, which is a reason with God, for granting to sinful men the hope and assurance of full and absolute pardon, at what time soever they repent of their sins, whether it be sooner or later,) have any tendency, either in these, or in any other respects, to render sinful men penitent and obedient, is the query at present. I think, they have no tendency this way; because, in the circumstances mentioned, their influence upon the reformation of the hearts and lives of sinners must always be defeated, over-ruled, and destroyed, by the hope they afford them, at the very time they are offending, of absolute impunity, upon repentance, though ever so late; which hope must always supply a corrupt mind with encouragement to go on in the practice of sin, and to defer his repentance till such time as he becomes sensible that his dissolution is at hand, and that the opportunity

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 183

tunity for repentance may be forever lost, if it be not presently laid hold on.

§. 15. AGAIN, if the procurement of a full and absolute pardon, to be granted unto sinners, at what time soever they repent of their sins, whether it be sooner or later, was God's real design in giving his dear son to perform a perfect obedience to him, in a state of great humiliation, and through a course of the greatest trials and sufferings; and if the procurement of that pardon, was, likewise the intention of his well-beloved son, in condescending to perform that perfect obedience, in the state and circumstances mentioned; then it is very evident, that the consideration of the great love of God and of Christ, and of the dignity of the person of the latter, must, in this affair, prove a very natural and efficacious mean, to remove from the minds of sinners, at the very time they are offending, or about to offend, all fear of danger and punishment; and to strengthen their expectation of absolute impunity; for it furnishes them with ground to hope that the former may be wholly avoided, and the latter effectually secured, by a subsequent repentance, at any time performed. This hope, thus raised, must, of necessity, supply sinners with reason to think, that present sinning is very consistent with future safety and happiness; and that it will always be consistent

with them, as long as there is any time left for repentance: And about this last, they will have no fear, while their bodies remain in health and vigour, and death appears to be at a distance; consequently, it must, all that while, conduce to fix in them a light opinion of the malignity and danger of sin, and of God's abhorrence of it; and to render them easy and undisturbed in the very commission of it. Thus it appears, that the love of God and of Christ, and the dignity of the person of the latter, considered in relation to the end to which they are made subservient in the *Dr's* scheme of redemption, have a real tendency, not to render sinners penitent and obedient, but to encourage and harden them in a wicked course of life, and to corrupt them more and more, at least, as long as they enjoy health of body, and are not apprehensive of the near approach of death.

§. 16. 'Tis true, the life of Jesus exhibits a most consummate pattern of piety and goodness, and a view of the vast worth and importance of them. It gives us such a full, fair, and amiable view of these, as cannot but greatly affect, move, and influence all uncorrupted and ingenuous minds; yea, corrupted minds, in some measure, if it is but placed in a due light, and has not its influence obstructed by interposing objects, and improper circumstances. But
if

if this very pattern of piety and goodness, and exhibition of the vast worth and importance of them, are to be considered, by men of corrupt and wicked minds, as a reason with God for granting to them a full and absolute pardon of their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, whether it be sooner or later; I cannot see, that they can have any influence at all, to render them penitent and obedient, before they are alarmed with the fear of the near approach of death. The minds of corrupt men are blind to the beauty and importance, of piety and goodness; yea, have a real aversion and disrelish towards them; and are carried, by strong, predominant affections and passions, after contrary objects. The more perfect any pattern of this kind is in itself, the more disgustful is it to them: and if it should be set by a being of superior mental perfection and ability, this would only discourage them from essaying to copy it over in their behaviour, as thinking it much too perfect for being imitated by creatures so weak, and so much inferior, as they are. In a word, such corrupt creatures could not enter upon the imitation of such a perfect pattern of piety and goodness without great difficulty, and offering violence to their most prevailing appetites and passions: nor, indeed, could they have any sufficient reason, or motive, to determine
them

them to engage presently, and while health remains, in such a troublesome and difficult affair, provided this very piety and goodness, of which they have a perfect pattern exhibited in the life of Jesus, be a reason with God for granting to them a full and absolute pardon of their sins, at what time soever they repent of them, even though they should not repent before the last and closing scene of life. Under such an apprehension as this, they must think it both wise and safe, to persevere, for the present, in that course of life which is agreeable to their corrupt appetites and depraved inclinations; since all the danger, thence arising, may be fully and effectually prevented by a late or death-bed repentance. I cannot, therefore, see, what influence the life of Christ, considered as a pattern of perfect piety and goodness, and as an exhibition of the vast worth and importance of them, can have upon the reformation of sinners, provided it be a reason with God for granting to them a full and absolute pardon of their sins, at what time soever they repent of them: but on the contrary, I think there is abundant reason to apprehend, that it would have a different effect upon them.

§. 17. UPON the whole, we may conclude, that the sacrifice of Christ, in the *Dr's* sense of it, and as it is circumstanced in

Chap. II. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 187

in his scheme, has no tendency, in any respect, to render sinners penitent and obedient; but a very direct and strong one to corrupt their morals, and to render them easy and secure in the practice of sin and disobedience, as long, at least, as they enjoy health, and have any prospect of the continuance of life; which I think, is an evident demonstration of the absurdity and falsehood of his notions of the nature and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ. In the scriptures, indeed, a reforming influence upon the moral temper and behaviour of men, is frequently ascribed to the sacrifice of Christ. And there is no doubt, but it has such a reforming influence; and that it will be seen to have it, as soon as it is rightly understood. But the *Dr's* notions of this sacrifice, as we have seen, not only destroy its influence this way, but give it a contrary one; and, for that reason, are unscriptural; and are no better (though the *Dr.* thinks otherwise) than those other notions of it, of the like bad tendency, which have been adopted by others.

§. 18. BEFORE I conclude this part of my work, I must caution my reader, to understand what I have said, concerning the ill tendency of the *Dr's* notions about the efficacy and effect of the sacrifice of Christ, as a consequence which I charge upon his doctrine

doctrine only, and not upon himself, as a thing which he either saw, or did admit of. I have such an high opinion of the *Dr's* good sense, and of his sincere and hearty concern for the interests of piety and virtue, and the credit and honour of revealed religion, that I am persuaded, had he seen that this ill tendency of the sacrifice of Christ was a real consequence of any principle, or principles, adopted by him, he would have renounced these principles directly, on account of their bad tendency. And as to his not seeing the ill tendency of his doctrine concerning redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, the *Dr.* is only in the same state of blindness with most other modern divines, whose schemes of redemption are, in one respect or other, chargeable with the same ill tendency. And, therefore, his case, because it is a common one, is not much to be wondered at. *Humanum est errare.* Thus much I judged necessary to be said here, in vindication of the *Dr's* reputation, honour, and good intention. I now go on to

C H A P. III.

Containing an examination of Dr. Taylor's notion of the effect which the sacrifice of Christ had with God, as being a reason with him, for granting the remission of sins to sinners upon repentance.

§. 1. **D**R. Taylor frequently intimates, that the sacrifice of Christ had its effect with God as supplying him with a reason for granting the remission of sins, or as being a reason of his forgiving them. His words are, “ The shedding of his (*i. e.* Christ's) blood
“ had its effect with God, as it supplied such
“ a reason for the forgiveness of sins, as the
“ wisdom of God, our Saviour, thought
“ most proper and expedient, and without
“ which he did not think it proper or expedient to forgive them ^a. ” — “ The sacrifice of Christ was a reason with the governor of the world, for granting the
“ remission of sins ^b; ” — “ The transgressions
“ and sins, which the Jews committed,
“ (under the law of Moses,) could be re-
“ deemed by the blood of Christ no other-
“ wise, than as his blood was a reason with
God,

^a See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. VIII. §. 147.

^b Ibidem, §. 149.

“ God, for remitting these transgressions,
 “ by releasing them from the penalty of the
 “ law, which is death eternal ^c.”—“ We
 “ are reconciled to God by the death of
 “ his son, as his death was a reason of God’s
 “ remitting the sins of the gentile world,
 “ which were past ^d.”—And he says, that
 the death or sacrifice of Christ, because it is
 a moral mean of our sanctification, and has
 a natural tendency to render sinners penitent
 and obedient, is “ the properest and noblest
 “ reason with God, for granting the remis-
 “ sion of sins ^e ;”—“ the ground and reason
 “ of the remission of our sins ^f ;” “ a reason
 “ with God for the forgiveness of sins ^g ;”—
 “ a reason of God’s forgiving our sins ^h .”

§. 2. As the *Dr.* makes, what he calls,
 the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and
 goodness of Christ, to be a reason with God
 for granting the remission of sins, because
 it has a natural tendency, as a moral mean,
 to render sinners penitent and obedient ; and,
 as I have shewn in the foregoing chapter,
 that this sacrifice, as it stands, and is cir-
 cumstanced, in the *Dr.*’s scheme, has not
 this,

^c See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined,
 Chap. VIII. §. 150.

^d Ibidem, §. 151.

^e Ibidem, Chap. X. §. 171.

^f Ibidem, Chap. XI. §. 184.

^g Ibidem, §. 185.

^h Ibidem, §. 187. See also Chap. X. §. 168—171.
 And Chap. XI. §. 184—191.

Chap. III. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 191

this, but a contrary tendency; it follows, that the sacrifice of the perfect obedience and goodness of Christ cannot, for the reason assigned by the *Dr.* be any reason with God, for granting the remission of sins. And with this conclusion I might here terminate the examination of this point. But that I may leave nothing undone, that may serve to shew the absurdity and falshood of this principle, I shall examine it by itself, and abstracted from the connection which it has with the other part of the *Dr's* scheme.

§. 3. HAD the *Dr.* in the several passages, which I have quoted from his book, inserted the word *mean*, or *medium*, in place of the word *reason*, I should have had nothing to object here: for had he done so, he would have spoken conformably to the language and sense of the scriptures, which very often speak of our redemption, and the remission of sins, as being (*ἐν*, or *διὰ* with a genitive case following it) *in*, *by*, or *through* the death, blood, cross, or sacrifice of Christ, as a mean of conveyance; but never once mention them, as being *for*, or, *on account of*, that sacrifice, as a reason for the grant or conveyance of these blessings: and many of the texts of scripture, which he has quoted in several places of his book, would have effectually supported this doctrine. But the *Dr.* in assigning the sacrifice of Christ as a reason of
God's

God's remitting sins, or as a motive by which he is determined to grant this favour to sinful men, has, I think, departed both from scripture-doctrine, and from common sense. What the *Dr.* has advanced from the scriptures in support of this doctrine, I have already examined, and shewn to be weak and inconclusive[†]. The only thing, therefore, which remains to be considered, is, its consistency, or inconsistency, with reason and common sense.

§. 4. ALL the reasons which either are, or can be, assigned for any voluntary action of an intelligent mind, are one or other of the three following; either (1.) The primary motive by which he is excited and determined to do the action; which is always some affection or inclination of nature. Or (2.) The end which the agent proposes to subserve or promote by the action; which is commonly called the final cause of the action. Or (3.) The fitness and rectitude of the action.—Thus we say, that a man performed such an action, because he was excited or moved to do it by this or that affection; or because he proposed to gain this or that end by the action; or because he judged the action to be right and reasonable.—Besides these three reasons, I know none that can be assigned for any moral action, of an intelligent mind. If the *Dr.* knows of any other reason
of

[†] See Part II. Chap. I. §. 15—28.

of action, I hope that he will be pleased to rectify my mistake.

§. 5. IF, therefore, it be clearly proved, that the sacrifice of Christ neither is, nor can be, a reason of any of these three kinds with God, for granting the remission of sins; then it will follow, that it neither is, nor can be, a reason of any kind with him, for granting this blessing to sinners. This, therefore, I shall here endeavour to prove in a clear and satisfactory manner. And

§. 6. *First.* THE sacrifice of Christ cannot, as a primary motive, be a reason with God, for granting the remission of sins; because the primary motive to every voluntary action, is some affection or inclination of nature. That some affection or inclination of nature, is the primary motive to every voluntary action, is what every man feels in his own experience. And that this is the primary motive by which the deity was, and is, determined to grant the remission of sins, the scriptures every where declare. This is what the *Dr.* himself acknowledgeth in the following words, “ The design of it (*i. e.* of “ the sacrifice of Christ) could not be to “ make God merciful, or to dispose him to “ spare and pardon us, when, as some suppose, so great was his wrath, that had not “ Christ interposed, he would have destroyed “ us. This is directly contrary to the most “ plain and certain notions of the divine
O good-

“goodness, and to the whole current of
 “revelation; which always assures us, that
 “the pure love of God to a sinful world
 “was the first mover and original spring of
 “the whole of our redemption by Christ,
 “John iii. 17. All that Christ did,—was by
 “the will and appointment of God, and
 “was conducive to our redemption only in
 “virtue of his will and appointment, Heb.
 “x. 7. John v. 30.—vi. 27. 38^k.”

§. 7. *Secondly.* THE sacrifice of Christ cannot be the final cause of the action of the deity in granting the remission of sins; nor, consequently, a reason with God, as such, for granting that favour to sinful men. If we should suppose, that the sacrifice of Christ was the final cause of the grant of the remission of sins, or the end which God proposed to himself by this grant, and, as such, the reason of his granting the remission of sins; the very supposition would supply us with such an absurd and horrid notion of deity, as I chuse not to mention.—Besides, it would make the remission of sins not to be the effect of Christ's death; but Christ's death to be the effect of the remission of sins; which is contrary to common sense, the whole current of scripture, and to the *Dr's* own better doctrine. It therefore, remains

§. 8.

^k See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined Chap. IX. §. 154.

§. 8. *Thirdly.* THAT the sacrifice of Christ, if it is a reason with God, for granting the remission of sins, it must be a reason with him for making that grant, because it did constitute, or was included in, the rectitude of the action of remitting sins. But the sacrifice of Christ did neither constitute, nor belong to, the rectitude of the Deity's action in remitting sins: and, therefore, could not be a reason with God, as being included in it, or belonging to it, for the performance of that action: which I thus prove.—The rectitude of a moral action consists in three things, *viz.* In the rectitude (1.) Of its primary motive; (2.) Of its end; and (3.) Of its fitness to promote that end. Besides the rectitude of these three, I can conceive of nothing that is included in the rectitude of any moral action. For if such an action proceeds from a right motive, and be directed to a right end, and has a proper tendency and due fitness to promote that end, it is, in all respects, a right action, and there is nothing wanting to its rectitude.—But now it seems to me, to be plain and evident, that the action of the deity in remitting sins, has no dependence at all on the sacrifice of Christ, for the rectitude either of its primary motive, or of its end, or of its tendency and fitness to promote that end: for, if it had, it would follow, that in the performance of this action, God could not act upon a right

O 2

motive,

motive, nor aim at a right end, nor direct the action to such an end in a right and proper manner, but for the sacrifice of Christ: and yet it would, I think, be very absurd to think, that the deity has not a capacity for doing all and each of these things, without any assistance from the sacrifice of Christ, or from any other external consideration whatever. To suppose that he has not such a capacity, would supply us with very unworthy notions of his power, wisdom, and goodness. More particularly,

§. 9. THE rectitude both of these affections or natural inclinations, which are the primary motives to the actions of the deity, and of these ends which he proposes to himself when he doth act, depends entirely on the essential perfection of his own mind; which is such, that he has, at all times, and in all cases, a perfect, comprehensive, and clear view of the good and evil of all objects and actions, and of the several degrees of good and evil in them; and is duly affected by these his perceptions of good and evil, and of the several degrees of them; so that he can, at no time, nor in any case, affect or pursue that which is evil, or not affect and pursue that which is good; or detest that which is evil, or affect that which is good, but in proportion to the degree of good or evil which he sees in it: or, which, in this case, is the same thing, in proportion to the real degree of
of

Chap. III. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 197

of good or evil in it. Wherefore, since the rectitude of the motives upon which God acts, and of the ends which he proposes to himself when he doth act, is thus, at all times, and in all cases, the necessary and unavoidable result of the essential perfection of his own mind; 'tis plain, that the rectitude of these neither is, nor can be, constituted by any thing that is unessential to his own all-perfect mind.

§. 10. AGAIN, as to the tendencies of actions; these are fixed and immutable things, and result, in such a necessary and unavoidable manner, from the very essences of actions and things, that they cannot be separated from them, nor be any way changed, by any means, or power whatsoever, so as to become other than they are. The rectitude, therefore, of the tendency and fitness of actions, in relation to the particular ends which are proposed to be subserved by them, doth not depend on the changing or mending the tendencies of the actions; but on a right choice of such actions as have a proper tendency and due fitness to promote the end, or ends, proposed to be subserved by them. And, for this reason, the rectitude of the tendency and fitness of the actions of the deity, in relation to the ends proposed to be subserved by them, must depend on his making a right choice of such actions as have a proper tendency and due fitness to promote the

the said ends ; and, consequently, on a due use of his all-perfect understanding, and not on any thing that is unessential to his own nature, such as the sacrifice of Christ is.

§. 11. UPON the whole, then, it appears, that the rectitude of the action of the deity in remitting sins, is, in every suppposeable respect, independent on the sacrifice of Jesus Christ: consequently, that this sacrifice as constituting the rectitude of that action, or making it a right action, neither is, nor can be, any reason with God, for the performance of it.

§. 12. OBJECT. If it should be objected here, that the grant of the remission of sins to offenders, at what time soever they repent of them, would be an encouragement to sin and disobedience, unless this grant was qualified, and the ill consequences of it guarded against, by the intervention of the sacrifice of Christ: And, therefore, the grant of this, without the intervention of the sacrifice of Christ, would have been a wrong action: consequently, it is by the sacrifice of Christ, that it is made a right action.—This seems to have been the *Dr's* way of thinking and reasoning¹. And therefore, I have here exhibited it, in order to answer it.

§. 13. ANSW. (1.) If, by the remission of sins, we understand, not a full and absolute

¹ See Scripture-doctrine of Atonement examined, Chap. X. §. 164—171

Chap. III. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 199

lute remission, not a remission of that penalty which is due even to penitents themselves, on account of the faulty part of their moral character ; but only a remission of the penalty which is proper in the case of impenitence, and to which penitents had been obnoxious while they remained impenitent, together with such a measure of favour and reward as bears a due proportion to the measure of that obedience which is subsequent to repentance, whatever it is ; I say, if we understand the remission of sins in this limited sense, the grant of it is a right action, and such as cannot be attended with the ill consequence mentioned, or any other : and, therefore, it stands in no need of being qualified and guarded by the sacrifice of Christ, or any thing else, in order to render it a right action ; neither of that sacrifice, as thus qualifying and guarding it, a reason with God, for the grant of it.—But (2.) if, by the remission of sins, we understand a full and absolute pardon, or a release from every penal evil ; the grant of such a remission would be a wrong action, as being necessarily and unavoidably attended with the bad consequence aforesaid. This action is incapable of being guarded, qualified, or circumstanced, by any means whatsoever, so as to be rendered a good or right action, or hindred from being an encouragement to sin and disobedience. It can never cease to be a wrong ac-

tion ; never become a right one. The more pains are taken by the legislator, to correct its obliquity and ill tendency, (even supposing it were by the death of his own dear son, or by the perfect obedience and goodness of his whole life,) this, instead of correcting and mending, would only encrease and augment them, as I have demonstrated in the foregoing chapter. Wherefore, since the sacrifice of Christ cannot change the nature of this wrong action, nor be any antidote against its ill consequences, it can be no reason with God for the performance of it.— And this, I think, is a full and satisfactory answer to the objection under consideration.

§. 14. BUT if, after all, the *Dr.* or any other person, should still think, that the action of the deity in giving his own dear son to be a sacrifice for sins, because it is subordinate to his action in granting the remission of sins, must have been a reason with him for the performance of the latter action : every body, I think, must see that this is wrong reasoning, and that the very reverse holds true. A subordinate action is always done for the sake of the principal action to which it is subordinate ; but a principal action is never done for the sake of the subordinate action. Wherefore, although the action of the deity in giving Christ to be

Chap. III. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 201

a sacrifice for sin, was really subordinate to his action in granting the remission of sins, as it certainly is; yet it will not follow, that his giving Christ to be a sacrifice for sins, was a reason with him, for granting the remission of sins; on the contrary, it will follow, that his granting, or his intention to grant, the remission of sins, was a reason with him, for giving Christ to be a sacrifice for sins. For if this is not allowed, the subordination of the action of giving Christ to be a sacrifice for sins, to the action of granting the remission of sins, will be destroyed.—

If any person, in order to preserve this subordination, should allow that the granting the remission of sins was a reason with God, for giving Christ to be a sacrifice for sins; and, at the same time, affirm, that the sacrifice of Christ was a reason with him, for granting the remission of sins; this is only going round in a shameful circle, by assigning one thing as the reason of another thing, and then assigning that other thing as the reason of that which is the reason of itself; which every body knows, is a gross absurdity in reasoning; the very same, as it would be, to make any effect the cause of itself, that is, no effect at all.—The only reason with an intelligent mind, for performing one subordinate action preferably to any other, is, because he thinks it has a greater tendency or fitness than any other, to subserve

his

his intention in the performance of the principal action to which it is subordinate action, though chosen, for the reason mentioned, preferably to any other subordinate action, is no reason at all with the agent, for the performance of the principal action to which it is subordinate. The reason, therefore, for the performance of any principal action, and the reason for the performance of any action which is subordinate to it, are, in all cases, two different things. The former is always antecedent to the latter in the order and train of the mind's thoughts: for if the reasons for the performance of principal actions did not first exist, and affect the mind, there never would, never could, be any reason at all for the performance of any subordinate action whatsoever. If so, no subordinate action is, or can be, a reason with any intelligent mind, for the performance of the principal action to which it is subordinate: consequently, God's giving Christ to be a sacrifice for sins, which is a subordinate action, neither is, nor can be, a reason with him, for granting the remission of sins, to which action the former is subordinate.

§. 15. INDEED, impotency, or a defect of power to perform the subordinate action is, in many cases, a reason with intelligent minds, for the omission or non-performance of the principal action to which it is subordinate.

But

But then, though inability to perform the subordinate action, is frequently a reason for the omission of the principal action; yet a bare ability to perform the subordinate action is, in no case, a reason with any intelligent mind, for performing the principal action: consequently, the Deity's ability to give Christ to be a sacrifice for sins, could be no reason with him, to grant the remission of sins. And even supposing, (contrary to all reason,) that this had really been a reason with God for granting the remission of sins, yet it would be nothing to the *Dr's* purpose, because, in this case, the reason with God for granting the remission of sins, would not be the sacrifice of Christ; but his own power, or ability, to give him to be a sacrifice for sins.

§. 16. FROM the whole, (when the reasons of action have been considered in their whole extent, and in every possible view, in relation to the subject under consideration,) 'tis manifest, I think, that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ neither is, nor can be, a reason of any kind with God, for granting the remission of sins. He, indeed gave his own dear son to be a sacrifice for sins. But this he did not do, with an intention that this sacrifice might furnish him with a new reason, which he had not before, for granting the remission of sins; but only with this view, that that sacrifice might be a mean

mean of rendering the conveyance or grant of this favour consistent with the end and rectitude of his moral government over mankind, or, which amounts to the same thing, conducive, upon the whole, to the happiness of our species. The mean, in this case, as in all others, was chosen for the sake of the end; and not the end, for the sake of the mean. The desire of the end was a reason with God, for choosing the mean; but the desire of the mean was no reason with him, for choosing and prosecuting the end. The mean, because it was chosen by infinite wisdom, must, in all respects, be proper, and adequate to the end intended: but still it was only the mean by which, and not the reason for which, the end was prosecuted. This way of thinking supplies us with consistent and noble ideas of the attributes of Deity, particularly, of his goodness and mercy to sinners: it is good common-sense; and, if I am not mistaken, the only scheme of thoughts that is conformable to, and consistent with, the doctrines of revelation.

The Conclusion.

I have now finished this part of my design. And in the execution of it, have shewn, I think, that the *Dr's* notion of the sacrifice of Christ, as being the perfect obedience

Chap. III. *the Sacrifice of Christ examined.* 205

dience and goodness of his whole life, has no support from these texts and facts in scripture, which he has produced as proofs and illustrations of it: that, though his notion of the sacrifice of Christ was a true and just one, yet this sacrifice, as it stands, and is circumstanced, in his scheme, has no tendency to render sinners penitent and obedient; but a direct and very strong one, to encourage and harden them in sin and impenitency, and to corrupt them more and more: and, finally, that the sacrifice of Christ, either in the *Dr's* notion of it, or in any other notion of it, neither is, nor can be, any reason with God, for granting the remission of sins: consequently, that the *Dr's* notion of the sacrifice of Christ is unsupported by any evidence; and that his whole scheme of man's redemption, by that sacrifice, is a contradiction to scripture, and to reason and common-sense.—In examining the *Dr's* scripture-evidence, I have followed the dictates of common sense, and observed the rules of just and sober criticism, with the utmost candour and impartiality: nor have I overlooked or concealed any thing that appeared to me to be favourable to his sentiments; but have endeavoured, as far as I was able, to go to the very bottom of things, with a pure and disinterested view to the discovery of truth. And whether I have done justice to the subject,
and

and to the *Dr's* sentiments, must now be left to the determination of those who have a capacity for judging in this affair, and integrity to judge in it without prejudice or wrong bias; to whose judgment, and the *Dr's* own serious consideration, I now humbly submit the criticism.—For myself; I am a lover of truth, and a friend to free and candid inquiry. I have no private interest that I could wish to serve, or to be served, by error and falsehood. I lie open to conviction, and shall always be ready to correct any error in my sentiments as soon as I perceive it; and be very grateful to any person who will take the pains to set me right when he finds me under any mistake. *Errare possum, hereticum esse nolo.* May liberty and truth, in conjunction with piety and virtue, always prosper and prevail; and make their influence over mankind good against all opposition.

The END of the SECOND PART.



A P P E N -



A P P E N D I X II.

Containing an examination of another notion of the symbolical meaning and use of Jewish-sacrifices, which is exhibited in an anonymous piece published at London, ann. 1746. and intituled, An Essay on the nature, design, and origin of Sacrifices.

THE Author of this piece appears to be a man of great learning; but his inferences and reasonings from facts, generally speaking, are not so natural, clear, and conclusive, as to afford that satisfaction which a sincere and judicious enquirer after truth desires to have, and must have, before he can yield his assent. It would require the writing of a large volume to enter thoroughly into all the reasoning of this Author which are chargeable with this defect, and to detect the fallacy and weakness of them; a work which I have neither time nor inclination to undertake. All that I propose to do at present, is, to exhibit his notion of the symbolical nature and design of Jewish-sacrifices, and to examine whatever he has said in support of it.

The

The Author gives us his general definition of sacrifice in the following words, *viz.*

“ Whatever is given or offered, in a solemn
 “ manner immediately to God, so that
 “ part of it, or the whole is consumed,
 “ is what is meant by the word *sacrifice*.
 “ Whether it be upon an altar, or what is
 “ used instead of an altar; whether it be
 “ by fire, or in any other manner, is not
 “ material ^a.”

I rather choose to take this definition of sacrifice as it is, than to contend with the Author about the propriety and justness of it. However, I cannot but observe, that the idea of sacrifice which it exhibits, agrees to the meat-offerings and drink-offerings which were appendages of sacrifice, and are never in scripture, as far as I remember, called sacrifices; nor, indeed, can, strictly and properly speaking, be so called, because the materials of which they consisted were inanimate, and, of course, incapable of death ^b. But to proceed.

The Author clearly expresses his opinion about the general, ultimate end of all sacrifices, in the following passages of his book, *viz.*

^a Page 4.

^b The root זבח *zabach* signifies *maclare, sacrificare, to kill, or to sacrifice*. Hence the noun זבח *zabach*, which signifies *maclatio, animal maclatile, sacrificium, i. e. a killing, an animal capable of death, a sacrifice*. *vide Buxtorf. lexicon.*

viz. “ Sacrifices—implied men’s entering
 “ into friendship with God; or if they had
 “ violated friendship with God, by violat-
 “ ing the stipulation entered into, then sa-
 “ crifice implied a renewal of friendship ^c.
 “ the great end of all sacrifices—was to
 “ make friends with God ^d.—the reason for
 “ which sacrifices were intended, *viz.* to
 “ engage in solemn friendship with God ^e.
 “ —the nature and design of sacrifice being
 “ —to be in a state of friendship with him,
 “ &c. ^f. Sacrifices expressed in their way
 “ what was principally intended, which
 “ was friendship and reconciliation to God ^g.
 “ Sacrifices were all—applied to keep up
 “ friendship betwixt God and man ^h.—the
 “ original intent, and indeed the design of
 “ sacrifices, which was to be in friendship
 “ with God ⁱ.

From these passages, ’tis plain, that the
 Author makes the engaging in, the renewal
 of, or the keeping up, friendship with God,
 to be the ultimate end of all sacrifices in
 general. And in this I agree with him;
 because it must, without doubt, be the ul-
 timate end of all religious institutions, as
 such, to promote one or other of the ends
 mentioned, or, to be the means of pleasing
 God.—When, therefore, the ultimate end
 P of

^c Page 59. ^d p. 95. ^e p. 102. ^f p. 120.
^g p. 301. ^h p. 319, 320. ⁱ p. 347.

of sacrifice, specified by the Author, is added to his general definition of sacrifice, his definition of sacrifice will run thus, *viz.*
 “ Sacrifice is whatever is given or offered,
 “ in a solemn manner, immediately to
 “ God, with a view to engage in, renew,
 “ or keep up friendship with him, so that
 “ a part, or the whole of it, is consumed
 “ either upon an altar, or what is used in-
 “ stead of an altar; whether it be by fire,
 “ or in any other manner.”

The next thing which we have to consider, is, the Author's opinion about the meaning of sacrifices, or their use and design in reference to the end mentioned. And here, if I mistake not, we shall find his sentiments neither uniform, nor supported by good evidence.

He observes, “ that it has been thought,
 “ that sacrifices were external signs, by
 “ which the desires of people were express-
 “ ed,—and were the same thing as prayer
 “ or thanksgiving, only expressed by ex-
 “ ternal signs instead of words;” and that Dr. *Outram* had cited passages from *Abarbanel*, to shew, “ that the Jews thought
 “ their sacrifices to be a sort of symbolical
 “ prayers to God for pardon or blessings*.”
 But this notion of the meaning and use of sacrifices, our Author censures and rejects
 as

* Page 298, 299.

as a mistaken representation of them¹ and he says expressly, "it is neither a just nor
 " a full representation of the fact. Sacri-
 " fices were always accompanied with
 " prayers or thanksgivings, and therefore
 " were not external rites by which prayer
 " or thanks were intended to be signified,
 " or the desires of the people were intended
 " to be expressed."^m—And yet we find
 the Author, about eleven or twelve pages
 below, adopting and defending this very
 notion of the meaning and use of sacrifices
 which he here rejects, and confutes as a
 mistaken and unjust representation of them :
 for he says expressly, " that sacrifices were
 " the external visible mode by which the
 " internal acts of the mind were expressed ;
 " —external visible signs of solemn prayer
 " and a purified heart ;—visible external
 " expressions of repentance, and renoun-
 " cing whatever was inconsistent with that
 " temper of mind that is necessary to a
 " state of friendship with Godⁿ; that is,
 P 2 external

¹ Page 298.

^m p. 300, 301.

ⁿ " Sacrifice was the—external visible mode by
 " which the internal acts of the mind were expressed.
 " Hence that (*viz.* making atonement) was imputed
 " to sacrifice which was owing to what sacrifice sig-
 " nified." page 312. And a little below, " No
 " wonder then that that was imputed commonly to
 " the blood of the victim which was the real effect
 " of solemn prayer, and a purified heart, since the
 " one

external signs, or symbols, of repentance, prayer, and a purified heart.—Here, therefore, the Author contradicts himself, by adopting and defending a notion of the meaning and use of sacrifices, which he himself censures and condemns as a mistaken and unjust representation of them. And into this self-contradiction he was driven by the impossibility of accounting, by his real idea of the use and design of sacrifice, for an effect which is, every where, in the levitical-law, ascribed to piacular sacrifices, *viz.* the making atonement for sin.—The case was this: atonement for sin signifies, with our Author, the means by which the pardon of sin is obtained°. Now atonement for sin being commonly mentioned in the law of Moses as the effect of piacular sacrifices; and the Author thinking it absurd to affirm, that atonement was made for sin, or the pardon of it obtained, by sacrifice in his sense of sacrifice, that is, by the *dapes* of a table, or by God and the owners

“ one was the external and visible sign of the other.” p. 313. And a little farther below, “ the shedding of blood was the usual and general, the ordinary and common means of atonement, or of expressing a right mind.” p. 316. Agreeably to all which he says, “ Sacrifices were the visible external expressions—of repentance, and of renouncing whatever is inconsistent with that temper of mind that was necessary to a state of friendship with God.” p. 350.
• Page 306.

owners eating and drinking together, as a symbol of friendship, or fœderal rite; he begins, like a man in distress, to look about him for relief; and finding, that his own fixed and settled idea of the use and design of sacrifices could yield none, he deserts it as a thing that could do nothing for him, and adopts another, which, though he had, before hand, rejected and confuted, yet was better adapted to his present purpose, and calculated to remove the otherwise insuperable difficulty out of his way. Accordingly, he tells us, "that pardon was never
 " obtained by sacrifice alone, but as it was
 " attended with a right disposition of mind;
 " that pardon may be, and has been, obtained by such a disposition of mind,
 " without the concurrence of a sacrifice;
 " and that sacrifices, considered as modes
 " of engaging in friendship, could, of
 " themselves, contribute nothing towards
 " the making atonement for sin, or the obtaining of the pardon of it." And then, to preserve some appearance of harmony between this language and that of the scriptures, which speaks of atonement for sin as being the effect of piacular sacrifices, he is led to affirm, "that sacrifices were the external and visible mode by which the internal acts of the mind were expressed;

P 3

" the

“ the external and visible signs of solemn
“ prayer and a purified heart ; and the vi-
“ sible external expressions of repentance,
“ and of renouncing whatever was incon-
“ sistent with that temper of mind that is
“ necessary to a state of friendship with
“ God ;” which is that very notion of the
meaning, use, and design of sacrifice, which
he himself had, before, censured and con-
futed, as a mistaken and unjust representa-
tion of them.

One would have thought, that the per-
ception of the impossibility of accounting,
upon his scheme, for atonement for sin, as
an effect of sacrifice, would have led the
Author to resign it as indefensible ; and to
have looked out for some other notion of
the meaning and design of sacrifice, which
would have fairly and satisfactorily account-
ed for it, as such. But, instead of this,
he adheres tenaciously to his favourite sys-
tem ; and, in order to extricate himself
from an insuperable difficulty, which did
attend it, runs into plain and palpable self-
contradiction.—This is a glaring instance of
the ill effect which bigotry in opinion, and
unreasonable attachment to any favourite
hypothesis, which has been adopted without
due examination, have upon the minds of
men, even of good sense and great learning.
Human frailty !—But what I would chiefly
remark here, is, that this specimen of our
Author’s

Author's inability to account for atonement, as an effect of sacrifice, without deserting his own notion of the use and design of sacrifice, and having recourse to another which he had disclaimed and confuted, gives us room and ground to suspect, that his notion of the use and design of sacrifice may neither be true nor scriptural.

I now proceed to the consideration of what appears to me to have been the Author's fixed and settled notion of the meaning, use, and design of sacrifices.

He tells us, "that sacrifices were fœderal rites, and implied men's entering into friendship with God; or if they had violated friendship with God, by violating the stipulation entered into, then sacrifices implied a renewal of friendship—with him^a." And agreeably to this, he says, "that sacrifice was intended as a mode of engaging in friendship^r."

If we want to know in what respect, or sense, the Author considered sacrifices as being fœderal rites, and a mode of engaging in friendship, he explains himself on this head, by telling us, that sacrifices were symbols, external signs, and expressions of friendship^s.

P 4

But

^a Page 59.

^r p. 306.

^s "Sacrifices were the visible external expressions of friendship with God." p. 350. "Sacrifices were

But if we would have a clear and adequate idea of our Author's opinion about the meaning, use, and design of sacrifices, we must hear him further on this point. He says, "To eat and drink together was the ancient manner of men's engaging in friendship with one another; and therefore it is natural to conceive that they should take the same method, and observe the same rite, in engaging in friendship with God: and if they imagined that

were significant rites, and expressed in their way, what was principally intended, which was friendship and reconciliation to God." p. 301.—"His design (God's, in the institution of sacrifices) was, to retain whatever was necessary to the keeping up of friendship, symbolically intimated in the use of such things as were the ordinary signs of friendship." p. 115.—"Supposing now that eating and drinking together were the known ordinary symbols of friendship, and were the usual rites of engaging in leagues and covenants, and of renewing and ratifying friendships, it will not be difficult to account from hence for the origin of sacrifices," (*viz.* by considering them as having come into use for the same purposes, in affairs between God and men.) p. 73. In like manner, speaking of peace-offerings, he saith, "They who offered these sacrifices, were looked upon as in a state of friendship with God, and as partaking of the known symbols of friendship," (*i. e.* of sacrifices, which were symbols of friendship.) p. 80. And still to the same purpose, speaking of the meat-offerings and drink-offerings, he saith, "The reason why a meat-offering and drink-offering were annexed to these two kinds of sacrifices, (burnt-offerings and peace-offerings,) is, the symbols of friendship were offered, p. 278.

“ that the Gods did eat with them, as they
 “ did with the Gods, they would make the
 “ same rites serve for amity and friendship
 “ with them, as they did with one another.
 And to the same purpose, he saith, “ Eating
 “ and drinking together was the known me-
 “ thod of old of engaging in friendship, and
 of making covenants and leagues; and if, at
 “ any time, men had forfeited their engage-
 “ ments, or had broken them, they were,
 “ in fact, reconciled by the same means by
 “ which they were at first engaged together.
 “ Now it seems very natural for men who
 “ were desirous to make or renew their
 “ friendship with God, to pursue the same
 “ means and practices, as they did with one
 “ another.—Whatever was the method by
 “ which the men of old engaged in cove-
 “ nants, or whatever federal rites they used,
 “ or by which they endeavoured to establish
 “ the securest friendship with one another,
 “ that would naturally be the means of en-
 “ tering into friendships with God. Eating
 “ therefore and drinking with God at his
 “ table, would be as natural a sign of friend-
 “ ship with God, as it was with any of their
 “ own species.”

From this view which we have taken of
 the Author's sentiments about sacrifices, it
 appears,

appears, he assumes for certain fact, and a first principle, that eating and drinking together was, in ancient times, a rite by which men entered into leagues and covenants, and engaged in, and renewed, friendships with one another: and that he imagined, that sacrifices, at the beginning, came into use and practice, upon the footing of this ancient custom of entering into covenants, and engaging in, and renewing friendships by eating and drinking together; this method of contracting and renewing friendships being transferred from a common and ordinary to a religious use, and made to subserve the same purpose in men's transactions with God, as it did in their transactions with one another.—

Agreeably to these notions of the origin and use of sacrifices, the Author conceives, that sacrifices were the *Dapes*, *Epulae*, or furniture of a table, at which God and the offerers of them did eat and drink together; that his and their eating together, was a symbol or emblem of friendship betwixt them; or a fœderal rite by which he and they, according to the then prevailing custom of the world, did engage in, renew, or keep up friendship with one another; and withal, that this symbolical or emblematical use of sacrifices was the sole and whole intent or design of them^w. The

^w That the Author's notions about the use and design of sacrifices are truly and rightly represented here, is

The truth of these notions of our Author about the origin, use, and design of sacrifices, depends upon the truth of the three following propositions, *viz.*

First. That, at the time when sacrifices came first into use and practice among men, eating and drinking together was an usual and customary rite, by which men entered into leagues and covenants, and engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendship with one another.

Secondly. That it is natural to think, that men would make use of this method, or rite,

is evident from the following passages of his book, *viz.*
 “ Sacrifice was the *Dapes*, or *Epula*, which the offerer
 “ partook of, when he was deemed worthy to be admitted to a state of friendship.” p. 301. —“ The
 “ owners of all peace-offerings having a certain share
 “ for themselves to eat, at the same time, that other
 “ parts were consumed on God’s table, as it were by
 “ him;—Hence those who offered these sacrifices
 “ were looked upon as in a state of friendship with
 “ God, and as partaking of the common symbols
 “ of friendship.” p. 80. “ When a table was furnished out with meat, it was necessary that bread
 “ should likewise be prepared; and accordingly, the meat-offerings of flower were constantly attendant on the sacrifices of animals.” p. 90. “ A
 “ table, by means of which a friendship was to be engaged in, or, if it had been broke, was to be re-established, would not have been properly furnished, if something that was usual to drink had not been
 “ annexed to the flesh and *Mincha*.” p. 104. “ Some
 “ sort of-liquor being always required as an ingredient at all entertainments, this was the reason why it was
 “ used at all sacrifices; and for the same end in both cases, *viz.* the keeping up a state of friendship by
 “ eating and drinking together.” p. 108.

rite, of eating and drinking together, in engaging in, renewing, and keeping up friendship with God: and that in fact, they did make use of it for these ends and purposes.

Thirdly. That, in all sacrifices, God and the offerers of them did actually eat and drink together, in some sense or other, either literally, or figuratively and symbolically.

These three propositions comprehend the essential parts of the Author's sentiments about the origin, use, and design of sacrifices. And, therefore, if it shall be found, that he produces a good proof of the truth of them, his system must stand upon a firm and solid basis, and ought to be admitted by all reasonable men. But if it shall be found, that he fails in the proof of all or any of them, that system cannot be regarded any further than as being an ingenious imagination or conceit of the Author, which has nothing to support it. I shall therefore consider all that he has advanced to prove the truth of each of these three propositions, and examine the strength and validity of it.

SECTION I.

Containing an examination of these arguments, which the Author has advanced, to prove, that, at the time, when sacrifices first came into use and practice, eating and drinking together was an usual and customary rite, by which men entered into leagues and covenants; and engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendships with one another.

THE first proof, which the Author brings of this point, is taken from the covenants which Isaac made with Abimelech, Jacob with Laban, and the Hebrews with the Gibeonites. He says, "When the men of old contracted leagues, or engaged in friendships with one another, they did it by eating and drinking together. This appears from the instances of Isaac and Abimelech, Jacob and Laban, the Hebrews and the Gibeonites. Gen. xxvi. 30, 31.—xxx. 46. Josh. ix. 14^a."

ANSW. If it should be allowed, that eating and drinking was the rite by which the covenants, mentioned, were entered into by the contracting parties; yet these covenants are too late transactions for proving, that eating and drinking together was an usual and

and customary rite, by which men contracted covenants and engaged in friendships, at the time when they first began to offer sacrifices. Sacrifices had been in use for the space of two thousand years, and upwards, before the first of these covenants was made. And, therefore, the instances, here alledged, neither do, nor can, prove, that men, when they first began to offer sacrifices, made use of the same rite in engaging in, and renewing, friendship with God, which they had formerly been accustomed to observe, in making leagues and covenants with one another. If our Author, or any other person, would produce instances of covenants among men, that were contracted by the rite of eating and drinking together, which are really to the purpose; these covenants must be such as were not only contemporary with, but more ancient than, those oblations which Cain and Abel offered to God; that is, they must be of an older date, by the space of above two thousand years, than these which our Author mentions. And, if I mistake not, there will be some difficulty in finding them.

Another thing that is very unfavourable to the Author's sentiments, is, that it doth not appear, from any thing that is said in the places to which he refers, that eating and drinking was a rite by which the covenants,

venants, there mentioned, were made, or entered into.

The covenant between Isaac and Abimelech was made by no other method than that of mutual agreement, and the oath of both the contracting parties to observe and fulfill what they had promised to each other, as is evident from Gen. xxvi. 28—31. Isaac indeed, on that occasion, made a feast for Abimelech and his attendants; and he and they did eat together, v. 30. But this feast was made, before he and Abimelech entered into a league of friendship with one another, as appears from the history, and was only a mark of respect which he put upon a great personage, who had come, in a very amicable manner, to seek, and to enter into a covenant of friendship with him. But it was not any rite by which they engaged in covenant or friendship; for the only rite, by which they did this, was a solemn oath, as appears from v. 28, 31.

The covenant, likewise, between Jacob and Laban, was made and entered into by an appeal to God as a witness of their sincerity, and a solemn oath to perform what they had mutually promised to each other, as is evident from Gen. xxxi. 49—53. On that occasion, indeed, Jacob took a stone, and set it up for a pillar; and his brethren did gather stones, of which they made an heap; and he and they did eat together upon
this

this heap. But all this was only preparatory to their engaging in a covenant of friendship. The pillar was set up, and the heap raised, as a standing memorial of the covenant which they were about to make ; and they did eat together upon the heap, in testimony of the cordiality with which they were to enter into a covenant of amity and friendship : But neither the pillar, nor the heap, nor their eating together upon the heap, were any part of their actual engagement in a covenant of friendship, or any rite whereby they entered into such an engagement. These were all of a preparatory nature only ; all executed previously to their making or entering into a covenant. — The covenant which followed, as is evident from the history, was not made or contracted by any of these precedent transactions, but by mutual promise, calling upon God as a witness of their sincerity, and solemn oath. — After the covenant was thus made, it is, indeed, said, v. 54. *Jacob offered sacrifice* (Heb. killed a killing, of killable animals) *upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread, and they did eat.* But as this was done after the covenant was made, their eating and drinking together could not have been any of these rites by which that covenant was made or entered into ; and therefore, it makes nothing for the Author's purpose.

The

In like manner, the covenant between the Hebrews and the Gibeonites was made and contracted by no other mean, or rite, than that of a solemn oath. *Joshua made peace with them, and made a league with them to let them live; and the princes of the congregation sware unto them*, Josh. ix. 15.—It is said indeed, v. 14. *And the men took of their victuals, and asked not counsel of the Lord*. But then, since it appears from the history, that this happened before Joshua made a covenant with the Gibeonites, 'tis clear, that the taking of their victuals, could have been no fœderal rite by which the covenant with the Gibeonites was made, or entered into. Besides, it is utterly improbable, that Joshua and the elders of the congregation would have taken of the dry and mouldy bread which the Gibeonites had brought with them, and have eat of it with them. And, indeed, this passage, as it runs in the Hebrew, gives us no reason to think that they did. The passage in the Hebrew is, ויקחו חמשים מצרים. And the true literal translation of these words, is, *And they received (or accepted of) the men* (מצרים mitzedam) *for, or, on account of their victuals, or mouldy and spoiled provisions*^b.

Q

And

^b מצרים mitzedam, for, because of, on account of, *their victuals*. The prefix מן min hath this signification in composition, in other places; particularly, Deut. vii.

And so the words give us an account of the way and manner in which the Hebrews were deceived by the Gibeonites, and induced to make a covenant with them. They did not *ask counsel of the Lord*, as they ought to have done, but they *received*, or *accepted of the men*, as persons of probity and integrity, *because of their victuals*, which, being spoiled and mouldy, made them believe that they had come from a far country. This rendering is exactly agreeable to the Hebrew, and gives a sense which is natural, probable, and supported by the context and common sense : whereas the other rendering, which we have in our translation, is forced and unnatural, and gives a sense which is improbable, and, indeed, which one knows not what to make of it. And it deserves remark, that the Hebrew, rendered in the former way, says nothing at all about eating and drinking together, and still less about eating and drinking together, as a symbol of friendship, or a fœderal rite.

Upon the whole, it is manifest, I think, that none of the three covenants mentioned, was entered into, or contracted, by eating and drinking together, considered as a fœderal rite. In the first, eating and drinking together

8. מאהבת יהוה, *for, because of, on account of, the Lord's love to you*, ומשמרו *umishmorro, and for, because of, on account of, his keeping the oath which he had sworn to your fathers.*

together was prior to the fœderal engagement; and, for that reason, was not the rite by which the covenant was made or entered into. At the making of the second, there was eating and drinking together; but then this eating and drinking together was before, and after, the covenant was made; and, therefore, cannot, in reason, be deemed any of those rites by which it was made and entered into. And for the covenant between the Hebrews and the Gibeonites, it doth not appear, from the history, that the contracting parties did eat and drink together. When the Author, therefore produceth these three as instances of covenants which were made and contracted, by the rite of eating and drinking together, he misrepresents real facts.—When the ambassadors of princes, or even men of inferior rank, meet together about negociations of peace and friendship, it has been, and still is, customary for them, to make entertainments, at which they eat and drink together. And this is all that was done by the men of old, on the like occasions. But however these entertainments may be considered as marks of esteem, honour, and friendly disposition; yet they never are, never were, considered as rites by which the treaties of peace and friendship which they negotiate, are made, entered into, or ratified.

The Author, as a farther proof, that eating and drinking together was, among the ancients, a fœderal rite subjoins, “ The
 “ breach of covenants thus confirmed (*viz.*
 “ by eating and drinking together) was
 “ deemed as gross a violation of friendship
 “ as any one could be guilty of. Thus Da-
 “ vid complains, that his *own familiar friend,*
 “ *in whom he trusted, which did eat of his*
 “ *bread, had lift up his heel against him,*
 “ Psal. xli. 9. And our Saviour applied this
 “ passage of the psalmist to the traitor Ju-
 “ das,—*He that eateth bread with me, hath*
 “ *lift up his heel against me.* When Ishmael,
 “ the son of Nethaniah, and the ten men
 “ that were with him, treacherously slew
 “ Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, to whom
 “ Nebusaradan had committed the people
 “ that remained in Mizpah, it is said, that
 “ he and his companions came to Mizpah,
 “ and there they did eat bread together, *i. e.*
 “ there they bound themselves together in
 “ the strongest band of confederacy to mur-
 “ der Gedaliah, which they accordingly ef-
 “ fected. Or, if they did eat bread together
 “ with Gedaliah, their treachery was so much
 “ the grosser, and their infamous behaviour
 “ was so much the more to be detested. *Vide*
 “ Jerem. xli. 1. The prophet Obadiah has
 “ alluded to the same custom, and made use
 “ of the same expression with the psalmist,
 “ *The men that were at peace with thee,*
 “ (Edom)

“ (Edom) *have deceived thee ;—they that*
 “ *eat thy bread, have laid a wound under*
 “ *thee. v. 7^c.*”

ANSW. In the passages, here quoted, there is nothing that can be deemed sufficient to make any reasonable man think, that eating bread together is mentioned in them, in allusion to a custom among men of entering into leagues and covenants of friendship by eating and drinking together. David's familiar friend did eat of his bread ; Judas the traitor did eat of Christ's bread ; and Ishmael and his ten companions came to Gedaliah to Mizpah, and there they did eat bread together ; and they who were to destroy Edom were such as did eat of his bread : but it doth not appear, that any of these parties ever entered into a covenant of amity with one another ; nor is there any reason to think, that their eating and drinking together is mentioned as an allusion to a custom of entering into and ratifying covenants by that rite. On the contrary, their eating together is evidently mentioned, not as a fœderal rite by which they actually entered into a covenant with one another, or as an allusion to such a rite ; but as an instance of friendly disposition and great goodness on the one side, and of the vilest dissimulation, treachery, and ingratitude on the other. The behavi-

Q 3

our,

our, therefore, of David's familiar friend, and of our Lord's perfidious disciple, in lifting up their heel against their benefactors, of whose bread they had eaten, and of Ishmael and his companions in murdering Gedaliah, after they had been received and entertained by him in a most kind and respectful manner, and of those who did receive kindnesses from the Edomites in becoming their enemies and destroyers, was not, as the Author would have it, a breach or violation of covenants of amity, which had been actually made between them by eating together; but a real and notorious instance of gross dissimulation, and of the vilest ingratitude and treachery, in those who had acted such an infamous and villainous part. Hence it appears, that the passages referred to, afford no instances of covenants that were made and entered into by the rite of eating together, nor contain any allusions to a custom among men of contracting and ratifying covenants by such a rite; consequently, these passages make nothing for the Author's purpose.

This then is the whole direct scripture-evidence which the Author has produced, in order to prove, that eating and drinking together was a fœderal rite among the ancients, by which they engaged in leagues and covenants of amity and friendship with one another. And from the answers which have been

been made to the several parts of it, it is manifest, I think, that this evidence doth not amount to a clear and good proof, or even to the shadow of a proof, of the point mentioned: and (which is still worse for the Author) that, if it did amount to a clear and good proof of it, yet it would, in no way, answer the Author's main purpose; because the transactions and allusions, upon which it is grounded, are too late for being proper vouchers of the truth of his opinion, *viz.* That eating and drinking together was, at the time when men first began to offer sacrifices, a known and customary rite by which they engaged in, and renewed, friendships with one another.

The Author, having now finished his direct scripture-evidence, next endeavours to produce some collateral proofs, which he places in such a light as renders them seemingly favourable to his opinion about sacrifices. But as those collateral proofs coincide with the subject of the next section, I shall consider them in it.

SECTION II.

Containing an examination of what the Author has advanced, to prove, that, upon the supposition, that eating and drinking together, was the customary rite by which men made and entered into covenants of amity and friendship with one another, it is natural to think, that they would follow the same method, and observe the same rite, in engaging in, renewing, and keeping up friendship with God; and that, in fact, they did use it for these ends and purposes, in the affair of sacrifices.

IN order to prove the proposition, contained in the title of this section, our Author advances many things, which I shall now consider in the same order in which they lie in his book.

He says, “ This (*i. e.* eating and drinking together were fœderal rites, by which men made, and entered into, covenants of friendship with one another, and with God) was so well understood by the ancients, that whenever any one offered a sacrifice to God, or to any idol whatsoever, it was looked upon as an actual engagement either in covenant, or friendship, with him to whom the sacrifice was made. And hence it is, that to
“ eat

“ eat of any sacrifice offered to God, is the
 “ same thing as to be in friendship with
 “ God : as likewise to eat of a sacrifice of-
 “ fered to any idol, is to be in friendship
 “ with that idol. It was this that made the
 “ psalmist say, *Gather my saints together unto*
 “ *me, those that have made a covenant by*
 “ *sacrifice with me*, Psal. l. 5. And when
 “ the Moabites are said to call the people
 “ of Israel unto the sacrifices of their gods,
 “ the people did eat, and bowed down to
 “ their gods ; it immediately follows, *And*
 “ *Israel joined himself to Baal-Peor*, Numb.
 “ xxv. 2, 3. This practice was so well
 “ understood, and was so common in those
 “ days, that when the Israelites were forbid
 “ to make any covenant with the inhabitants
 “ of the land of Canaan, it is expressed thus,
 “ *Lest when the Canaanites did sacrifice unto*
 “ *their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat*
 “ *of his sacrifice*, Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16.
 “ *i. e.* engage in covenant or friendship with
 “ their gods. So again, *they joined them-*
 “ *selves also to Baal-Peor*, and eat the offer-
 “ ings of the dead, *i. e.* they entered into
 “ a state of friendship with gods that were
 “ no more than dead men. And hence it
 “ was, that when the first-born of Egypt
 “ were threatened with destruction, that
 “ God, by Moses, instituted the passover,
 “ by which a covenant was made betwixt
 “ him and the children of Israel.—A Lamb
 “ for

“ for every house, (or if the household was
 “ too small, then a man and his neighbour
 “ next unto him were to join in procuring a
 “ lamb,)—A lamb was to be taken; and
 “ as there was no altar, the blood was to
 “ be *struck upon the lintel, and the two side-*
 “ *posts of the door,* which served instead of
 “ an altar. And then the Lord, on his
 “ part, engaged that he would *not suffer the*
 “ *destroyer to come into any of their houses,*
 “ Exod. xii. 23. The children of Israel
 “ were to eat the flesh of the lamb with one
 “ another; and this was an ordinance to
 “ be kept forever. The blood, upon this
 “ occasion, was given as God’s share: and
 “ then immediately the people were under
 “ his protection.”

ANSW. I grant, that sacrifices were means
 by which men engaged in covenant and
 friendship with God. But that eating and
 drinking with God was the sole use and de-
 sign of sacrifice, and that this eating and
 drinking with God was a symbol of friend-
 ship with him, and a foederal rite whereby
 he and the offerers of sacrifice did engage
 in covenant and friendship with one another;
 and, consequently, that the eating of any
 sacrifice was, in this sense, the same thing
 as engaging in covenant or friendship with
 God; these are things which I cannot ad-
 mit,

mit, without a good and clear proof of them. The Author here alledges some passages of scripture as a proof of them: but none of them, I think, come up to the point, as will appear from a particular inspection of them.

The first passage quoted by the Author, is, Psal l. 5. *Gather my saints together unto me, those who have made a covenant by sacrifice with me.*—Here mention is made of a covenant which had been made with God by sacrifice. But then there is nothing said, from which it can be inferred, that the offerers of this sacrifice did eat or drink with God, or that his and their eating or drinking together was a symbol of friendship betwixt them, or the fœderal rite by which they engaged in covenant with one another. Of all this there is neither a word nor hint in the text; and therefore it proves nothing that is for the Author's purpose.

The second text, which the Author quotes, is, Numb. xxv. 2, 3. *And they (the Moabites) called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods: and Israel joined himself to Baal-Peor.*—In these words it is intimated, that Israel joined himself to Baal-Peor, by eating of the sacrifices which were offered to this idol, and bowing down to him; whence our Author would infer, that the Israelites and the idol Baal-Peor did

eat

eat together; and, by eating together, (which was a fœderal rite and a symbol of friendship,) did enter into a covenant of friendship with one another. But of all this the text says nothing: for it only speaks of the Israelites as joining themselves to Baal-Peor, by joining with his worshippers in two acts of that idolatrous worship which they payed to him; by joining them in the one, as much as by joining them in the other; that is, by eating of the sacrifices which were offered to this idol, and by bowing down to him; and that without explaining the nature of either of these acts or rites of worship, or giving any hint that they were symbols of friendship or fœderal rites. In a word, all that this text says, is, that the Israelites joined themselves to Baal-Peor by joining in the acts of his worship, but says nothing of their doing this by any symbol of friendship, or fœderal rite. This text, therefore, proves nothing for the Author's purpose.

The third text quoted by the Author, is, *Exod. xxxiv. 15.* where the Israelites are forbid to make any covenant with the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, for the following reason, *viz. Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they (the Israelites) go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.*—Here the

the Author says, that the meaning of these last words, *and thou eat of his sacrifice*, is, and thou engage in covenant and friendship with their gods: and from this he would infer, that the eating of a sacrifice with the god to whom it was offered, was a symbol of friendship with him, and a fœderal rite by which the owner of the sacrifice did engage in covenant with him. But this is pure imagination, for the text says nothing about it, nor supplies any hint from which it can be inferred. The eating of any sacrifice that was offered to an idol, was, as is well known, an act of idolatry, or idolatrous worship, and as such only is it mentioned in the text, and not as a symbol of friendship with the idol, or a fœderal rite.

The text mentioned next by the Author, is, Psal. cvi. 28. *They joined themselves also to Baal-Peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead.* Here the Author is at it again with his favourite comment. *They ate the sacrifices of the dead*, that is, says he, they entered into a state of friendship with gods that were no more than dead men; from which he would have his readers to infer, that eating the sacrifices of those gods, or dead men, was the same thing as engaging in friendship or entering into covenant with them; consequently, a symbol of friendship, and a fœderal rite. But of all this the text says nothing, which only speaks of the Israelites

as joining themselves to Baal-Peor by joining with the Moabites in his worship, and not by partaking of a symbol of friendship, or the performance of a fœderal rite; and mentions their eating the sacrifices of the dead, as an act of idolâtrous worship only, without taking any notice of its having a symbolical meaning and use, as an emblem of friendship, or a fœderal rite.

The last thing which our Author mentions as a proof of his point, is, the covenant which, he ingenuously supposes, was made between God and the Israelites by their eating together of the paschal lamb. “As
 “there was no altar, says he, the blood
 “was to be struck upon the lintel, and the
 “two side-posts of the door, which served
 “instead of an altar. And then the Lord
 “engaged, on his part, that he would not
 “suffer the destroyer to come into any of
 “their houses. The children of Israel were
 “to eat the flesh of the lamb with one
 “another.—The blood, upon this occasion,
 “was given to God’s share; and then im-
 “mediately the people were under his pro-
 “tection.” ANSW. It is no where said, or
 hinted, that God and the Israelites entered
 into a covenant by the paschal-sacrifice, or
 that he and they did eat together of this
 sacrifice, or engaged in covenant by eating
 of it together, or that the blood was given
 as God’s share. All these are new ways of
 speaking

speaking and thinking, of which the scripture knows nothing. It is most certain, that, at the institution of the passover, no covenant was entered into by stipulation and restipulation, or by the mutual agreement and consent of two parties. All was of God's appointment and ordering: and whatever was done by the Israelites, was done in obedience to his authority and express command; for their consent was not given or required previously to the injunction of it. As to the blood which was struck upon the lintel and the two side-posts of their doors; this, instead of being given to God as his share, which he was to eat, was only disposed of in that manner, that it might be to the Israelites, for a token upon the houses where they were; a token to them not of a covenant, or of God's entering into a covenant with them, but of divine protection from destruction; a token to them, that God would pass over them, and the plague should not be upon them to destroy them, when he smote the land of Egypt, *Exod. xii. 13.* Withal, this whole transaction was intended to be a memorial; not of any covenant-engagement, but of a great and miraculous deliverance. When, therefore, the whole affair is duly considered, it doth not appear to have any one circumstance in it, that is favourable to our Author's opinion about the symbolical nature

ture and design of sacrifices, as being symbols of friendship and fœderal rites.

The Author proceeds thus, "Hence it is, that one may easily explain what St. Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 21. *Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of devils: Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of Devils.* He had been urging the Corinthians to flee from idolatry, and was shewing them that, if they did eat of the sacrifices offered unto idols, they, by that act, professed themselves to be in a state of friendship with them. The Jews, by eating the sacrifices offered to God, partook of the altar or table of God, and by that were deemed to be in a state of friendship with him. The Gentiles, by eating the things offered to their gods, were, for the same reason, in a state of friendship with them. Now it is impossible, as the Apostle argues, to be in covenant or friendship with two such contrary masters; and consequently, the Corinthians ought not, could not, partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils, or dæmons^b."

ANSW. Whatever way be taken to explain this passage of St. Paul, I can see no reason or necessity for assuming the Author's notion

^b Page 63, 64.

notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifice, in order to give it a proper sense and just force. For neither in the text, nor in the context, is there any mention made, or hint given, that the god, or gods, to whom the sacrifice was made, did eat or drink with the offerers of it; or that their eating and drinking together was a symbol of friendship, or a fœderal rite by which they engaged in a covenant of amity with one another. All that is said, whatever be made of it, is, that the offerers of sacrifice did drink of the cup, and partake of the table of those gods to whom they offered sacrifice: and it is affirmed, that the thus partaking of the table and cup of the one true God, and of the table and cup of idol-gods, were inconsistent and incompatible actions, because it is impossible, that one should be a worshipper of the one only God, and, at the same time, a worshipper of false and fictitious gods. Taking then this along with us, St. Paul's words may, without having any recourse to the Author's mystical notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices, be well explained in the following manner, *viz.* the apostle had been exhorting the Corinthians to flee from idolatry; and was shewing them, that, if they did eat of those sacrifices which were offered to idols, they did, by that act, commit idolatry, and make it evident, that

R

they

they were worshippers of those idols. The Jews, by eating of those sacrifices of peace-offerings, which were offered to the one true God, partook of his altar and table; and, by this act of religious worship, appointed by the one true God, they shewed that they were worshippers of him, and not idolaters. In like manner, the Gentiles, by eating of the sacrifices, or partaking of the table of dæmons, or idol-gods, made it manifest, by this act of idolatrous worship, that they were idolaters, or worshippers of those dæmons, and not of the one only true God. Now, as the apostle argues, 'tis impossible, that christians should drink of the Lord's cup, and of the cup of dæmons, and partake of the table of both; that is, be worshippers of the one only true God, and, at the same time, worshippers of idol-gods, without acting a most absurd and inconsistent part, since no person can be accounted, or really be, a worshipper of the one true God, as such, who, by acts of worship, performed to other gods besides him, acknowledgeth their divinity, and, consequently, more gods than one. This I take to be the true sense of St. Paul's words. And I can perceive nothing in it, that is, in the least, favourable to our Author's mystical notion of the meaning and design of sacrifices, as being symbols of friendship and fœderal rites.

The

The Author, as a further confirmation of his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices, says, " Sometimes this manner of engaging in friendship was expressed by nothing more than drinking, without any eating together. The prophet Jeremiah says, *The Chaldeans, which fight against this city, shall come and set fire on this city, and burn it with the houses upon whose roofs they have offered incense unto Baal, and poured out drink-offerings to other gods, to provoke me to anger*, Chap. xxxii. 29. In another place, he speaks of the people of Jerusalem, as *having burnt incense unto all the host of heaven, and having poured out drink-offerings to other gods*, Chap. xix. 13. His meaning is, they, by this, (*i. e.* by pouring out drink-offerings) engaged themselves in friendship with, and obliged themselves to serve the host of heaven, or Baal, or whatever god they worshipped, just as if they had entered into an express covenant with them."

The two places, which our Author here quotes, are produced, in order to prove, that the manner of engaging in friendship and entering into covenant with God, or the gods, is sometimes expressed by nothing more than drinking without any eating together,

R 2

gether. But it is plain, that they prove no such thing: for there is not one word to be found in them about drinking together, or about any friendship or covenant that was entered into by this rite. So far from this, that they only mention the burning of incense, and the pouring out drink-offerings to Baal, or other gods, and the host of heaven, as acts of idolatrous worship which had been practised by the Israelites. The Author, indeed, says, "His (*i. e.* the prophets) meaning is, they by this (the pouring out drink-offerings) engaged themselves in friendship with, and obliged themselves to serve the host of heaven, or Baal, or whatever god they worshipped, just as if they had entered into an express covenant with them." But this interpretation is pure fancy and imagination, without any support from the common and natural signification of the words, or from any thing that is affirmed or hinted either in the text, or context, or, indeed, from common sense. Withal, if the Israelites did really engage in covenant or friendship with those idol-gods by pouring out drink-offerings to them, they must have done the same by burning incense to them; for both are mentioned as being their sin, and, consequently, as being the means by which they engaged in covenant with those idols, if, indeed, they did engage in covenant

nant

nant with them. Wherefore the Author, if he intends to make any thing out of these texts that is for his purpose, will have more work upon his hands than he was aware of; for it will be incumbent on him to prove, not that drinking together, but that the pouring out of drink-offerings, and the burning of incense, both of them; and the one as much as the other, were symbols of friendship, and foederal rites. I shall say nothing further here, but only that an Author, who is thus forced to produce texts, in which nothing is said about drinking together, to prove that drinking together was a symbol of friendship and a foederal rite, in the affair of sacrifices, appears to be much puzzled to find out any proper evidence, and exposes the weakness of his own cause.

The Author next says, that to conceive of drinking together to have been a symbol of friendship, and a foederal rite, " will help us to understand a passage in Isaiah, Chap. xxx. 1. which we translate, to *cover with a covering, but not of my spirit.*" but which, he says, may be translated, " that pour out a libation, but not after my mind." And thinks, that the pouring out this libation to the gods of Egypt was a foederal rite, and a manner of engaging in friendship and covenant with them^d."

R 3 ANSW.

ANSW. I will not dispute with the learned Author about the propriety and justness of his translation of this passage. I freely grant, that the Hebrew will bear it. But then I must observe, that, thus rendered, it conduces nothing either to the illustration or confirmation of his opinion about the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices: for it says nothing about the gods of Egypt and the Jews drinking together; much less about their drinking together, as being a symbol of friendship, and a fœderal rite, by which they engaged in friendship or covenant together; but only mentions the pouring out a libation to the gods of Egypt as an act of idolatry, of which the Jews had been guilty.

To support and strengthen his opinion further, the Author next endeavours to prove, that the Heathen considered sacrifices as being symbols of friendship, and fœderal rites. But as I am not here enquiring after Heathen opinions, but scripture-doctrines, I shall pass over this part of his performance without examining it.

The Author proceeds thus, "Supposing
 " now that eating and drinking together
 " were the known ordinary symbols of
 " friendship, and were the usual rites of
 " engaging in covenants and leagues, and
 " of

“ of renewing and ratifying friendships, it
 “ will not be difficult to account from hence
 “ for the origin of sacrifices. The fact is
 “ certain, that to eat and drink together
 “ was the ancient manner of men’s engag-
 “ ing in friendship with one another; and
 “ therefore it is natural to conceive that they
 “ should take the same method, and ob-
 “ serve the same rite, in engaging in friend-
 “ ship with God: and if they imagined
 “ that the gods did eat with them, as well
 “ as they did eat with the gods, they would
 “ make the same rites serve for amity and
 “ friendship with them, as they did with one
 “ another.”

ANSW. This way of accounting for the origin of sacrifices cannot, in reason, be admitted, till it be first proved, that eating and drinking together were, among men, the known ordinary symbols of friendship, and the usual rites of engaging in covenants and leagues, and of renewing and ratifying friendships, at the time when the oblation of sacrifices was first introduced as a mode of worship. And this is what still remains undone; for all the transactions and allusions, which the Author has produced as proofs of this point, are, as I have before shewed, too late for his purpose, by the space of two thousand years and upwards. And, which

R 4 is

is still more unlucky for him, those transactions and allusions, upon which he grounds his proof, do not even prove, that eating and drinking together was used as a symbol of friendship, or a fœderal rite, in those very ages when they happened, and were made; as is manifest from the foregoing examination of them: and, therefore, the Author affirms too much, much more than he has proved, or, I think, than can be proved, when he says, "The fact is certain, that to eat and drink together was the ancient manner of men's engaging in friendship with one another." Moreover, although eating and drinking together had really been the ancient manner of men's engaging in covenants and friendships with one another; "Yet it is not natural to conceive, that they would take the same method, and observe the same rite, in engaging in friendship and entering into covenant with God," so long as they retained any just and true notion of his spiritual and all-perfect nature. Men may eat and drink; and, by eating and drinking, their bodys are nourished, their life preserved, and their frame strengthened and exhilarated; for which reasons, it is not unnatural to conceive, that eating and drinking together might have been a symbol of friendship between man and man, or men and men, and a rite by which they entered into covenants,
and

and engaged in friendships with one another. But then, God is a pure and all-perfect spirit, and, as such, incapable of eating and drinking, or of receiving any refreshment or benefit from such actions. And, therefore, though the men of old had really made use of eating and drinking together as a symbol of friendship, and as a federal rite, in engaging in covenants and friendships with one another; yet it is altogether unnatural to conceive, that they would take the same method, and observe the same rite, in engaging in, renewing, and keeping up friendship with God. Before they did this, they must, according to the Author's own confession, have imagined, that the gods did eat with them, as well as they did eat with the gods; which, as far as it relates to the one true God, is a most gross and absurd imagination, destitute of all truth, inconsistent with the spirituality of the divine nature, and calculated to promote in men's minds a gross and wrong conception of it: and withal, such an imagination as the Jews were particularly cautioned against by God himself. *Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?* Psal. l. 13.

To support this notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices, the Author next endeavours to prove, "that it was the
" opinion of the Heathen world, that their
" gods

gods did eat of the sacrifices which were offered to them *.

ANSW. I shall not contend with the learned Author about this point, since the opinion of Heathens, in an affair of this nature, after they had lost the knowledge of the unity of God, and had imbibed gross and absurd notions of the nature of deity, particularly, that of the God's eating and drinking after the manner of men, deserves little regard, and cannot rationally be thought to be decisive in this point: especially, considering that the oldest voucher, which the Author produces of this opinion among the Heathen, is *Homer*, who wrote after the destruction of Troy, and consequently, above three thousand years after sacrifices had begun to be offered. But, if I may speak my mind freely, about this notion of eating and drinking gods, which was received in the heathen world; I am apt to think, that it owed its being and origin to the policy and artifice of their priests, who, to squeeze from the people a handsome and plentiful maintenance for themselves, infused the notion into their minds, that the gods were great eaters and drinkers. If the apocryphal story of the destruction of Bel and the dragon, or the opinion of those who forged it, deserve any regard, 'tis plain, that it was with a view to

to such a maintenance, that the priests of Bel made the people believe, that that god was such a voracious eater and drinker, as to consume every day *twelve great measures of fine flower, forty sheep, and six vessels of wine.* See the history itself, ver. 3—22. And, in fact, it is reported, that, in later ages, the Indian Bramins, with the same view, infuse into the minds of the people the same notion, that their gods are great eaters and drinkers ^h.

But to support his sentiments, the Author advances something which is more to his purpose, if there was any truth in it. He says, "This language so common among the

^h " Compluribus e plebe, idola admodum edacia, persuadent (sciz. *Brachmanes* :) ideoque pecuniam ipfis, et varia esculentorum genera adferenda, persuadent. Hoc nimirum commento sibi, suisque, vicum largè procurant. Hinc bis quotidie nimis credulum vulgus, per domesticos, nummum diis offert, Illi verò furiosorum more saltantes, sistratique, epulantur. Tunc idola cibum capere, miseris persuadentes. Et ne quid sibi suisve desit, idola esse vehementer irata, populo denunciant, quod imperata non fiant; et nisi deos placet muneribus, fore confirmant, ut aut occidantur ab illis, aut calamitatibus afficiantur, aut in ipsorum ædes immittantur dæmonia. His eos technis in errore metuque detinent. Quod quidem interdum etiam eorum aliqui non dissimulant; sed egestate se purgare conantur, quod, præter saxea ista idola, nihil in bonis habent." *Vide Joannis Metelli præfationem in historiam Hieronymi Osorii, Episcopi siluensis, de rebus ab Emmanuele, Lusitanie rege, gestis, ad Antonium Augustinum Archiepiscopum Tarracensem; Coloniae Edit. Ann. 1586. Fol. 31.*

“ the Heathen, of the gods eating of the
 “ sacrifices offered to them, is very similar
 “ to that of the sacred writings, where sa-
 “ crifices are called the bread or the food of
 “ God. Thus Levit. xxi. 6, 8. The priests
 “ are to be *holy unto their God, and not to*
 “ *profane the name of their God, for the of-*
 “ *ferings of the Lord made by fire, and the*
 “ *bread of their God, they do offer.—Thou*
 “ *shalt sanctify him, for he offereth the*
 “ *bread of thy God.* And in the same chap-
 “ ter, ’tis expressly ordered, that *no man that*
 “ *bath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest,*
 “ *shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the*
 “ *Lord made by fire;—He shall not come nigh*
 “ *to offer the bread of his God,* v. 21. He
 “ *might eat the bread of God,* v. 22. though
 “ he might not come nigh to offer it.—
 “ What is called, in this chapter, the bread
 “ of God, is not to be confined to the *Min-*
 “ *cha*, or what is called the meat-offering;
 “ but it signifies whatever was burnt upon
 “ the altar. Thus the peace-offering of the
 “ flock made by fire, consisting of a lamb,
 “ the fat and inwards and rump of which
 “ was burnt upon the altar, is called, *The*
 “ *food of the offering made by fire unto the*
 “ *Lord,* Levit. iii. 11. The prophet Ezekiel
 “ interprets the *bread of God* to be *the fat*
 “ *and the blood,* Chap. xliv. 7. And the
 “ prophet Malachi understood it in the same
 “ manner,—*Ye offer polluted bread upon mine*
 “ *altar,* Chap. i. 7. by which he means
 “ offer-

“ offerings that were *torn, and lame, and*
 “ *sick*, ver. 13. offerings highly improper to
 “ be put upon the Lord's table. *Vide* Levit.
 “ xxii. 24, 25. God himself, likewise,
 “ speaks in the same manner,—*Command the*
 “ *children of Israel, and say unto them, my*
 “ *offering, my bread for my sacrifices made*
 “ *by fire for a sweet savour to me, shall ye*
 “ *observe to offer unto me in their due season,*
 “ Numb. xxviii. 2. All eatables are called
 “ in scripture, bread; and as all sacrifices
 “ made by fire are deemed the bread or the
 “ food of God, what was consumed upon
 “ the Altar, was God's share, or portion;
 “ and the rest was the priest's or the own-
 “ er's share; and thus they all did eat at the
 “ same table¹.

ANSW. It is no where said, that the peace-
 offering is the food of the offering made by
 fire, as our Author affirms. We find in-
 deed, Levit. iii. 11—16. that the rump of
 the peace-offering, the caul above the liver,
 the kidneys, the fat upon the caul, and upon
 the *illia* and inwards, are called the food of
 the offering made by fire unto the Lord.
 And probably they are so called because, be-
 ing fat and combustible, they were the chief
 means by which the fire was fed and nour-
 ished whereby this oblation was burnt and
 consumed. But, whatever becomes of this
 conjecture, it is certain, that, in the places
 referred

referred to, neither the peace-offering itself, nor those parts of it which were burnt upon the altar, are called the food of God. And, therefore, these texts make nothing for the Author's purpose.

I must, indeed, acknowledge, that, in the other texts, mentioned by the Author, in some of them at least, sacrifices are called the bread or meat of God. Nevertheless, I can see no reason for thinking, that this language of the scripture is similar to that among the heathen, who spake of their gods as eating of the sacrifices which were offered unto them : for God is no where said to eat of any sacrifice that was offered to him. And say, that sacrifices are called the bread or food of God, yet this doth not come up to the Author's purpose, because sacrifices might very properly be called the bread of God, not because he did eat of them, or was to be conceived of as eating of them, but only because they were eatables which had become his property, either by the gift of the offerers, or as forfeits for their sins. The truth is, sacrifices were eatables which in the strictest sense, were God's property. He had, therefore the sole and entire disposal of them. No person could appropriate any of them, or any part of any of them, to his own private use without a special grant from him. On these accounts, sacrifices are very justly called the bread or meat of God : and they, who had
any

any share of them granted to them for food, are, with great propriety, said to eat the bread of God, the bread which was his property, and which no person might eat without a special grant from him. There is, therefore, no reason at all for admitting the Author's horrid hypothesis, *viz.* That sacrifices are called the bread or food of God, because he did eat of them.

There is one thing farther which deserves remark here; and that is, that the general conclusion, which the Author draws from the texts of this class, is so unguarded that one knows not how to understand it, or what to make of it. He says, "As all sacrifices made by fire are deemed the bread or food of God, what was consumed on the altar was God's share or portion; and the rest was the priest's or the owner's share: and thus they all did eat at the same table." Now if, by the part consumed on the altar's being God's share or portion, the Author means, as he must do, that it was the part of the sacrifice which God did eat: this is false in itself, and there is nothing in the scriptures that gives any countenance to such a gross conceit, as we have seen already. Again, if, by the rest's being the priest's or the owner's share, he means, as his hypothesis requires he should, that this was the case in all sacrifices; this is not true; because there were sacrifices of which neither the priest

priest nor the owners had any share at all : or, if he means, that there were some sacrifices of which the priest had a share, but not the owners ; and other sacrifices, of which both the priest and the owners had their proper and respective shares to eat ; this is very true : but then it comes not up to the Author's purpose, because, in all these sacrifices of which the owners had no share to eat, (and these were many,) the owners and God could not eat together, nor, consequently engage in, or renew friendship by this rite. Lastly, since there were sacrifices (particularly, those which the high-priest offered for the sins of himself and family, and for the sins of the congregation, and all burnt-offerings without exception) of which neither priest nor owner had any share to eat ; since there were other sacrifices (all those that were offered for particular sins committed by persons who were not priests) of which the owners had no share to eat ; since there were no sacrifices, but the peace-offerings only, of which both the priest and the owners had a share to eat ; and, withal, since God neither did, nor could, eat any part of any sacrifice ; with what propriety or truth could the Author say, thus they all (God, priest, and owners) did (in the affair of sacrifices) eat at the same table ? But some grains of allowance must be made to him for this

this round and unguarded assertion, since his hypothesis required him to say so much, and the saying less would not have answered his purpose.

The Author now comes to his general conclusion from the foregoing premises, which he endeavours to strengthen by some new matter. "Eating then, says he, of a sacrifice implied a state of friendship betwixt the offerer and God: and agreeably to the same manner or custom, the temple or tabernacle was God's house, the palace of the great king: the priests, that ministred to him, were his servants, who went between him and his people: the altar is called *the table of the Lord*, Mal. i. 12. And the offerings are called the bread of God. To eat, therefore, of the sacrifices offered to God, was to eat at his table, and of his bread. Now the owners of all peace-offerings, having a certain share for themselves to eat, at the same time that other parts were consumed on God's table, as it were by him,—Hence those who offered those sacrifices were looked upon as in a state of friendship with God, and as partaking of the known symbols of friendship, and thus in peace with him *."

ANSW. If, by eating of a sacrifice, the Author means, as he must do, eating of a
S
sacrifice

* Page 79, 80.

sacrifice with God ; eating of a sacrifice never did, never could, imply a state of friendship betwixt God and the offerer : the reasons are obvious, viz. because there were many sacrifices of which the offerers had no share to eat, and because God never did, in any case, or in any sense, eat of any sacrifice : for if the offerers, in many cases, did not eat of those sacrifices which they offered, and if God did, in no case, eat of any sacrifice with them ; 'tis plain, that God and the offerers of sacrifice did, in no case, eat together ; consequently that his and their eating of a sacrifice together never did, never could, imply a state of friendship betwixt them, or any thing else.—The Author, says, “ Agreeably to the same manner
 “ or custom, (*i. e.* of engaging in friendship
 “ by eating and drinking together,) the temple or tabernacle was God's house, the
 “ palace of the great king : the priests, that
 “ ministred to him, were his servants, who
 “ went between him and his people : the
 “ altar is called the table of the Lord ; and
 “ the offerings are called the bread of God.
 “ To eat, therefore, of the sacrifices offered
 “ to God, was, to eat at his table, and of
 “ his bread.”—Now all this (both the premises and the conclusion) is true : and yet, what the Author aims at, and, indeed, the only thing that can answer his purpose, will not follow, *viz.* That the temple or
 tabernacle

tabernacle was called God's house, or the priests his servants, or the altar his table, or the offerings his bread; or that the eating of sacrifices was to be considered as eating at his table, and of his bread, agreeably to the manner and custom of men's engaging in friendships and entering into covenants by eating together. For in all this language, there can be no allusion to such a custom among men, because there never was any such custom in being; also because there were many sacrifices of which the offerers had no share to eat; and because God did never eat of any sacrifice with the offerer. The owners, indeed, of peace-offerings, had a certain share of those sacrifices to eat, while other parts of them were burnt to ashes upon the altar. But then the parts, which were burnt upon the altar, were not eaten by God; and, therefore, although the offerers did eat their own share, and might be said to eat at God's table, and of his bread; yet God and they did not eat together; consequently, no covenant was entered into, nor friendship engaged in, by their eating together; of course, the offerers eating their share was no symbol of friendship with God; in the Author's sense. The Author's assertion, that the parts, which were consumed by fire upon the altar, were consumed (or eaten) as it were by God; is a pure conceit of his own, and such a conceit as is scarcely

consistent with common sense : for how that which was reduced to ashes by the fire of the altar, should in any sense, be consumed or eaten by God, is what I cannot comprehend ; especially, considering that that fire was not the shechinah, or symbol of the divine presence

Thus I have, carefully examined whatever the Author has advanced to prove, upon the supposition, that eating and drinking together were customary symbols of friendship and fœderal rites among men ; it is natural to conceive, that they would take the same method, and observe the same rites, in engaging in, and renewing friendship with God, and make the same rites serve for amity and friendship with him, as they did with one another ; and that, in fact, they did so. And, I think, that upon a careful review of the answers which have been made to every part of his reasoning upon these two points, it will appear to every judicious and unprejudiced person, that he has utterly failed in his proof of both. I now proceed to

SECTION III.

Containing an examination of the fact, Whether God and the offerers of sacrifices, did, or did not, eat together of these sacrifices.

I AM now to examine, whether God and the offerers of sacrifices did, or did not, eat together of these sacrifices ; and, consequently, whether their eating together of them, was, or was not, a symbol of friendship betwixt them, and a fœderal rite by which they engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendship with one another.

First. As to God ; 'tis clear, that he is a pure, immaterial, and all-perfect spirit, and, as such, incapable of eating and drinking in a literal sense. Nor is there any reason to conceive that he did eat or drink of the sacrifices which were offered to him, in a figurative or symbolical sense ; because, though those parts of sacrifices, which he is supposed to have eaten and drank, were consumed upon his altar, yet neither the altar, nor the fire by which they were consumed upon it, were the shechinah, or the symbol of his being and presence. Besides, such a representation of an eating and drinking god, had any such thing been intended, would have had a tendency to efface the notion of the

pure spirituality of his nature, in the minds of his worshippers, and to make them conceive of him as a material and corruptible being.

To soften and palliate this, and the other absurdities and ill consequences, with which his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices is embarrassed, our Author tells us, " That the customs of the world
 " had made sacrifice (which he supposes to
 " have been the *dapes*, or *epulæ*, of which
 " God and the offerers did eat and drink
 " together) the ordinary way of addressing
 " God.—And as this custom of sacrificing
 " was spread every where, God, in his wisdom,
 " would, not abolish this manner
 " of worship, but laid hold of it to keep
 " his people a holy people, separate from
 " the rest of mankind, and free from the
 " superstitions of the world. And this he
 " did in such a manner as would most certainly
 " have its due effect. The Jews,
 " therefore, were permitted, in a certain
 " measure, to use such customs as were universal;
 " and, at the same time, by having
 " a peculiar institution, different from their
 " neighbours, they were kept from their
 " idolatrys, and were made to serve the great
 " ends of providence in the world ^a."

ANSW.

^a Page 312—314.

ANSW. This account of the origin, and of the reason of the institution of jewish sacrifices, is obnoxious to various objections of great weight: but the only one which I have occasion to take notice of here, is, that had it been the real design of sacrifices to exhibit God and the offerers of them as eating and drinking together, and, consequently, to infuse into the minds of men a wrong and gross notion of the nature of God, as being corporeal and corruptible; 'tis more probable, that God would have entirely abolished that mode of worship, than have continued it, or permitted the continuance of it, in condescension to those prejudices in its favour, which had sprung from general practice and universal custom. We never find God, in other cases, so extremely complaisant to the prejudices of men and the customs of the world, as to institute modes of worship of a bad tendency for the sake of them.—At the time when the law of Moses was given to the Jews, we find, that mankind were as universally accustomed to idol-worship, as to sacrificing: and that the prejudice of the Jews in favour of this wrong way of worship, was as strong as it possibly could be in favour of the rite of sacrificing: and yet, because idolatry was a wrong mode of worship, as having a tendency to corrupt and efface men's notion of the unity of deity, God thought fit, in opposition to universal

custom, and the prejudices of the Jews themselves, to abolish idol-worship, and forbid the practice of it. If so; it will be hard to give a reason why he did not, likewise, utterly abolish the way of worshipping by sacrifice, provided that mode of worship had such a direct and natural tendency to eradicate out of the minds of men a just notion of the spirituality and incorruptibility of his own nature, as it must have had, according to our Author's notion of the use and design of it.—Again, at the time of the introduction of the Gospel-state, the mode of sacrificing was as universal, as it was at the time when the law of Moses was given; and men, every where, were as tenacious of it, as mad upon it, and as unwilling to part with it, as ever they had been at any former time: and yet God, instead of paying any manner of regard to this general custom of the world, or to the strong and inveterate prejudices of men in its favour, did utterly abolish that mode of worship, without minding or regarding any inconveniencies or bad consequences which might arise from the abolition of it. And this he did, not because this mode of worship had any thing in its nature that was absurd or irrational; since the Jews, for many ages, had practised it upon the footing of his own injunction and institution: but only because, being a part of a more imperfect scheme, it
was

was unfit for being admitted as a part of a more perfect and excellent dispensation of religion, which he was then erecting under Jesus the Messiah, for the general good and benefit, not of one nation only or chiefly, but of all mankind.—The first of these two instances, shews us, that God is not led by the customs of the world, and the prejudices of men, to adopt any thing, as a religious institution, that has a tendency to efface just notions of his own nature and attributes: consequently, that he would not have instituted sacrifices as a mode of worship, if the design of that institution had been to make men conceive of him as an eating and drinking God. The second instance makes it equally evident, that no customs of the world, no prejudices of men, how general soever, can induce God to adopt any thing, as a religious institution, but what is fit for answering his own end and intention in that dispensation of religion into which it is taken. And both, taken together, shew us, that God was not induced, merely by the customs of the world and the prejudices of men to adopt sacrifices as modes of religious worship; consequently, that our Author's account of the origin, and of the reason of the institution of Jewish-sacrifices, is imaginary, and entirely without foundation.

Upon

Upon the whole, it appears, I think, that God could not eat with the offerers of sacrifice in a literal sense, and that, in fact, he did not eat with them in a figurative or symbolical sense; consequently, that his and their eating together of sacrifices, as the *dapes* or furniture of a table, neither was, nor could be, a symbol of friendship betwixt them, or a fœderal rite whereby they engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendship with one another.

Secondly, As to the offerers of sacrifice; we are now to enquire, how far they were permitted to eat or drink, or did actually eat or drink, any part of those things which they offered in sacrifice. And, in examining this point, we shall find, that there was a long tract of time, in which it doth not appear that they had any share of the things, which they thus offered, to eat or drink; and that when they came, at last, to have a share of one species of sacrifice to eat, there were other species of sacrifices instituted, of which they were not permitted to eat any share; and these, such sacrifices as were of the piacular kind, and intended to be the means of engaging in, and renewing friendship with God.

First, There was a long tract of time, in which it doth not appear that the offerers of sacrifices had any share of the sacrifices which they offered, to eat or drink, *viz.*
from

from the time in which Cain and Abel offered their respective oblations to God, down to the days of Jacob, if not much lower. For during this whole period of time, which comprehends above two thousand years, we have, in sacred history, no account of any person who did eat any share of any sacrifice which was offered by him; nor, indeed, is there any mention made of peace-offerings as being then in use, the only species of sacrifice of which the owners were ever allowed a share of for their own use. Wherefore it doth not appear, that the offerers of sacrifice, through this whole period of time, did eat or drink with God; or that the sacrifices which they offered were the *dapes* of a table, at which he and they eat and drank together, and, as such, symbols of friendship and fœderal rites.

The Author, to extricate himself from this difficulty, saith, “ Though it be true
 “ that we meet with no express mention of
 “ peace-offerings before the law, and it
 “ may seem strange that we have no ac-
 “ count of them, when holocausts are so
 “ often mentioned; yet this is no argument
 “ to prove that there were no such things
 “ in practice. In an history of two thou-
 “ sand two hundred years, or more, there
 “ is no notice taken of any sacrifice at all,
 “ above five or six times: and in so short
 “ and

“ and concise an account of facts, one must
 “ not wonder if no mention is made of the
 “ several sorts of sacrifices, or the various
 “ rites used on such occasions ^b.” And agreeably to this hypothesis, he tells us in another place, “ that both Cain and Abel
 “ did eat of their oblations ^c.”——To all which I answer, that, in these passages, the Author doth not produce history, or evidence, but only supposes and forges facts without any history or evidence. This manner of arguing clearly shews us, what silly and wretched shifts men, even of sense and genius, are, sometimes, driven to make use of, to support a favourite hypothesis, which they have adopted.

Secondly, When we come lower down to the days of Moses, we find, a law was given to the children of Israel, in which we have an account given of the divine institution of several species of sacrifices, *viz.* burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings: which are all the sorts of sacrifices which are mentioned in that law. To these I shall add meat-offerings and drink-offerings, because, according to the Author’s definition, they are true and proper sacrifices; though, indeed, they were no more than appendages of the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. Here then
 we

^b Page 251, 252.

^c p. 179.

we are to consider, what share of these several sorts of sacrifices the offerers had to eat or drink.

(1.) As to burnt-offerings: this species of sacrifices had meat-offerings and drink-offerings annexed to it, Lev. xxiii, 12, 13, 18. Numb, xv. 1—12, 24. and Chapters xxviii. and xxix. Here then, there was, in our Author's phrase, the full apparatus of a table, flesh, bread, and wine: but then the owner of the sacrifice was nothing the better for it; for he was not permitted to eat or drink any part of these provisions. The whole apparatus was disposed of in the following manner, *viz.* The blood of the sacrificial animal was sprinkled round about upon the altar, and all the other parts of its body were consumed to ashes upon it by fire, Levit. chap. i. and chap. viii. 18—21. ix. 12—24.—The meat-offering annexed to this sacrifice, if the priest was the owner of it, was wholly burnt upon the altar, Levit. vi. 23. And if any other person was the owner of it, a memorial of it was burnt upon the altar, and the remainder was the priest's and his sons, Levit. ii. 2, 3, 9, 10. vii. 9, 10. And as to the drink-offerings, which were appendages of this species of sacrifice, the Author tells us, that they were poured out about the altar, particularly, at the south-west corner of it; for which he quotes Eccclus. l. 15. and Josephus's Antiquit.

quit. lib. iii. chap. x. where that Author says, they poured the wine (*περι τοῦ βωμοῦ*) *about the altar*^d. (to which he might have added Numb. xxviii. 7. *In the holy place shall thou cause the strong wine to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering.*) and to the same purpose, he says, “the wine, “among the Jews, was poured out about “the altar,—and the offerer did not taste “of it in the temple, any more than the “priests did^e.” Here then was a species of sacrifice, which, with its appendages, furnished out the full *apparatus* of a table, flesh, bread, and wine: and yet, from the way and manner in which the whole *apparatus* was disposed of, ’tis manifest, that it was not intended to be an entertainment of which God and the offerers were to eat and drink together. God did not eat or drink any part of it; and the offerers were not permitted to have any, even the smallest, share of it for their own use. Wherefore, the sacrifices of this species could not be, in the Author’s sense, symbols of friendship betwixt God and the offerers, or fœderal rites by which he and they engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship by eating and drinking together.

(2.) Sin-offerings and trespass-offerings were other two species’ of sacrifices, which were

^d Page 102, 105.

^e p. 104.

were instituted by the law of Moses. And here we are to enquire, whether these two species of sacrifices furnished out the *apparatus* of a table, and whether God and the offerers of them did, or did not, eat or drink together.—The Author himself tells us, that when these sacrifices were made, “there never was any oblation of fine flower, “no wine, no oil, no frankincense^f.” And to the same purpose, “that the sin-offering “and the trespass-offering had no meat-offering or drink-offering accompanying “them^g.”—However, in the case of a poor person, (as the Author himself acknowledgeth^h.) a trespass was expiated, without any animal sacrifice, by the oblation of *the tenth part of an ephah of fine flower*, Levit. v. 11—13.—From these facts it plainly appears, that the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings did not furnish out the *apparatus* of a table or entertainment. In most of them flesh was provided, but there was no bread, nor any thing to drink. In others, something was provided for bread, but there was neither flesh nor drink. So that in all these sacrifices, the *apparatus* of a table was not furnished, at least, was very poorly furnished out.—Again, our Author tells us, “that the owner did not partake of any of “these sacrifices, but the priests had their “portions,

^f Page 276:

^g p. 281.

^h p. 315.

“portions, and the rest was burnt¹.”—The first part of this last assertion is absolutely and universally true; but the latter part of it is not: for, after the proper parts of those sin-offerings, which were offered for the priest and his family, and for the congregation, were burnt upon the altar, all the other parts of them, the skin, flesh, head, legs, inwards, and the very dung, were carried out of the camp or city, and there burnt to ashes, so that the priests had no share of them, any more than the owners. *Vide*, Levit. iv. 3—21. ix. 8—11, 15. xvi. 27. But of the other sin-offerings, and of all the trespass-offerings, the priests had their portion, the rest was burnt, and the owners had nothing.—From these facts, it is clear, that no person or persons, whether the priest, or the congregation, or any one of the people, did eat, or partake of any share, of any of these sin-offerings or trespass-offerings which they offered for their own sins. Here, again, were two species of sacrifice, and such too as were offered, on purpose, to engage in, and renew friendship with God, of which the owners had no share to eat; and, indeed, in which there was not the proper *apparatus* of a table, at which God and they might eat and drink together. Neither, therefore, of these species of sacrifice could, in the Author’s sense

¹ p. 181.

sense, be symbols of friendship betwixt God and the offerers, or foederal rites by which he and they engaged in, and renewed friendship by eating and drinking together.

(3.) The last species of sacrifice, under the law of Moses, which we have to consider, is, the peace-offerings. These had meat-offerings and drink-offerings annexed to them, Levit. vii. 11—13. Numb. xv. 2—12. Here, therefore, was a species of sacrifices which did furnish out, what our Author calls, the *apparatus* of a table. And, which is still more to his purpose, the two kidneys, and the fat upon and about them, and upon the inwards; the caul above the liver, and the rump, were burnt upon the altar; the priests had the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder for their part; and the offerers or owners had all the rest of the flesh of the sacrifice to eat, Levit. ch. iii. and ch. vii. 11—18. and ver. 28—36. Numb. xviii. 11. Hence it appears, that the Author speaks truly, when he saith, “in peace-offerings, part was burnt; part “was eat by the priests; and the remainder “the owner had for his own use, to entertain himself, or his friends, as he pleased*.” Here, therefore, if in any sacrifices, we may expect to find God and the offerers eating and drinking together at a table furnished

T

nished out with a proper *apparatus*. And yet if we carefully attend to the nature of God, and to the way and manner in which the provisions, aforesaid, were disposed of, we shall find little reason for thinking, either that God and the offerers of these sacrifices did eat and drink together, or that their eating and drinking together was the principal thing, or any part of the principal thing intended. God, as we have already seen, did not eat or drink any part of the provisions mentioned, either in a literal or figurative sense: and for the offerers; though they had a part of the flesh to eat, yet they had not a bit of bread, or a sip of drink, to it. The drink-offering was poured out about the altar, according to the Author's own acknowledgment. And for the meat-offering, if it was the priest's, the whole of it was burnt upon the altar, Levit. vi. 23. and if any other person was the offerer or owner of it, part of it was burnt to ashes upon the altar, and the priests had the whole remainder towards their maintenance, Levit. ii. 2, 3, 9, 10. vi. 15, 16. Numb. xviii. 9.—Wherefore, although, in the sacrifices, called peace-offerings, there were such eatables and drinkables as usually constitute the *apparatus* of a table, at which friends eat and drink together; yet such is the nature of God, and such was the way and manner in which that *apparatus* was disposed

disposed of, that there is no room, nor reason, to think, that God and the offerers of these sacrifices did eat and drink together; or that these eatables and drinkables were prepared as a feast, or entertainment, of which both were to partake. To conclude; from the nature of God, we may be certain, that he did not eat or drink with the offerers of this species of sacrifice: and, from the way and manner in which the whole *apparatus* was disposed of, it is highly probable, that those sacrifices were never intended to be, in the Author's sense, symbols of friendship betwixt God and the offerers; or fœderal rites by which he and they engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship by eating and drinking together.

But if it should be granted, (yea, was it really true,) that, in peace-offerings, God and the offerers did eat and drink together, and that their eating and drinking together was a symbol of friendship, and a fœderal rite, by which they engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendship with one another; yet, in all other sacrifices, (such as burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings,) of which the owners had no share to eat or drink, this cannot be alledged with any shew or appearance of reason. For where the owners had no share to eat or drink, there God and they could not eat or drink together; consequently, their eating

and drinking together (there being no such thing) could not be a symbol of friendship, or a fœderal rite, by which they engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship with one another. This difficulty comes often in our Author's way; and, it being a dead weight upon his whole system, he uses several shifts to get rid of it. I shall here exhibit and consider the chief of them.

First. Our Author, in order to shew, that his notion of the symbolical use and design of sacrifices, is applicable to these sacrifices of which the owners had no share to eat or drink, argues in a pretty strange and uncommon manner. He says, "When
 " a burnt-offering was brought, the person
 " that offered it, looked upon himself as in
 " a state of offence.—He could not then,
 " under these circumstances, presume to
 " eat as a friend with God, till he had
 " made confession, and had declared him-
 " self a sincere penitent. Here then an
 " holocaust was to be offered, and a meat
 " and drink-offering accompanied it: but
 " the offender, considering himself as guilty,
 " acted as under a sense of guilt. He only
 " applied to be restored to favour, and did
 " not partake of the offering¹. And to the
 " same purpose, speaking of all piacular
 " sacrifices in general, he saith, no sacrifice
 " that

¹ Page 277.

“ that was offered on account of guilt for
 “ offences actually committed ; nor no sa-
 “ crifice offered for offences which men
 “ imagined or thought themselves guilty of,
 “ could be eaten of by the owner. The
 “ offender was too much a criminal in his
 “ own opinion, to be admitted to God’s
 “ table immediately. What, therefore, he
 “ offered to God was the beginning of re-
 “ conciliation. He laid his hands upon
 “ the sacrifice ; he confessed his sin ; he
 “ promised and professed repentance ; but
 “ till all this was done and over, he was
 “ an improper person to partake of the
 “ table of God, who was justly conceived
 “ to be displeased, or, at least, to have a
 “ right to shew displeasure ^m.”

ANSWER.

The Author here acknowledgeth, that the owners of piacular sacrifices did not eat or drink any share of them ; consequently, piacular sacrifices were not symbols of friendship in his sense, or fœderal rites, by which God and the offerers engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship, by eating or drinking together.—But the Author says, these sacrifices were an application to be restored to favour, and the beginning of reconciliation.

T 3

Be

Be it so; but still God and the offerers of them did not eat or drink together; consequently, these sacrifices were not, in his sense, symbols of friendship, or fœderal rites: and, therefore, his notion of the symbolical nature and use of sacrifices doth not, cannot, agree to them.

But to enter more thoroughly into this affair with the Author, I would fain know how, or in what sense, piacular sacrifices were an application to be restored to favour, and the beginning of reconciliation. Can it be thought that these sacrifices had a natural tendency or fitness to effect a reconciliation betwixt God and the offerers; and might, on that account, be deemed an application to be restored to favour, and the beginning of reconciliation? This is what the Author himself will, by no means, admit of; for he says, "repentance would always cōver sins, and make them not to be remembred or imputed to the sinner; and a sacrifice attended with repentance would always produce the same effect; and, without repentance, ten thousand sacrifices would never cause that sin should not be remembred." Accordingly he says, "pardon was never obtained by sacrifice alone, but as it was attended with a right disposition of mind; and pardon
" may

“ may be, and has been, obtained by a
 “ right disposition of mind alone, without
 “ the concurrence of any sacrifice.—The
 “ victim therefore, or the blood of the
 “ victim, or millions of hecatombs, or ten
 “ thousands of rivers of oil, can never, of
 “ themselves make atonement.” And
 agreeably to all this, he saith, “ When a
 “ sinner, at any time, repented, and con-
 “ fessed his sin, and offered his proper sa-
 “ crifice, he was then admitted to eat at
 “ God’s table, (this, we have seen before,
 “ was seldom, if ever, true,) as being in
 “ a state of friendship with God; that is,
 “ he was taken into favour, and the sin
 “ which he had been guilty of, was par-
 “ doned: not because he had offered up
 “ his sacrifice, but because he had returned
 “ to his duty, and had declared his return
 “ by this open testimony of sorrow for sin.
 “ The imputing to sacrifices, and to exter-
 “ nal rites, what was *wholly* owing to the
 “ moral disposition of the mind, is so much
 “ inconsistent with the reason of the thing,
 “ that we find, in scripture, sacrifices some-
 “ times treated as if they had never been
 “ required or commanded by God. The
 “ people imagined that they had done their
 “ dutys, when they had brought their sa-
 “ crifices to the altar, and had there pre-

T 4 sented

" sented them to God; and never thought
 " of that rectitude of mind, — without
 " which sacrifices were an empty, ground-
 " less ceremony^p," — According to this doc-
 trine of the Author, sacrifices, considered
 in themselves, were an empty, groundless
 ceremony, could make no atonement, had
 no natural fitness or tendency towards effect-
 ing a reconciliation between God and a
 sinner: and therefore, considered in this
 view, they could not be accounted an ap-
 plication to be restored to favour, or the
 beginning of reconciliation, or, indeed any
 thing but an empty, groundless ceremony.
 — In what sense then were piacular sacrifices,
 an application to be restored to favour, and
 the beginning of reconciliation? — truly, we
 had best consult the Author himself, for an
 answer to this knotty question. — He puts the
 question thus, what then was the use or de-
 sign of sacrifice? and then subjoins, " The
 " true answer to this, is, that sacrifice was
 " designed as a mode of engaging in friend-
 " ship, or as a desire of being reinstated in
 " friendship^q." And, a few pages below,
 he explains himself further upon this head,
 in the following words, " Sacrifice was the
 " customary, external, visible mode, by
 " which the internal acts of the mind were
 " expressed; hence that was imputed to sa-
 " crifice,

^p Page 304, 305.

^q p. 306, 307.

“ crifice, which was owing to what sacri-
 “ fice signified. The customs of the world
 “ had made sacrifice the ordinary way of
 “ addressing God: it put the offerer in
 “ mind of confessing his sins; and upon
 “ desiring reconciliation with God, and
 “ being restored to his favour; or of being
 “ admitted into friendship with him. No
 “ wonder then, that that was imputed
 “ commonly to the blood of the victim,
 “ which was the real effect of solemn
 “ prayer and a purified heart, since the one
 “ was the external and visible sign of the
 “ other”.—Here then, we learn, from the
 “ Author’s own words, in what sense he
 understood piacular sacrifices to be an ap-
 plication to be restored to favour, and the
 beginning of reconciliation. They were
 external, visible signs, or symbols, of a
 purified heart, of penitence, confession of
 sins, prayer for pardon, and a desire of re-
 conciliation; and, as such, they were, when
 accompanied with the things which they
 signified, an application to be restored to
 favour, and the beginning of reconciliation.
 Very well! but then the Author ought to
 have considered, that this is not his notion
 of the symbolical nature and design of sa-
 crifices; but a notion which he himself has
 expressly condemned, as an unjust and mis-
 taken

taken representation of them. He ought to have remembered his own words, "Sacrifices were always accompanied with prayers, or thanksgivings; and therefore were not external rites by which prayer or thanks were intended to be signified, or the desires of the people were intended to be expressed." Thus it appears, that the Author plays his game with two different notions of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices, making use of the one or the other, just as the case and his own distress required. But truly, this shuffling and doubling to get rid of difficulties, and to avoid the force of objections, only demonstrates, that he was incapable of defending his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices, and to bring it to any agreement with piacular sacrifices, in particular.

The Author saith, the offender laid his hands upon the sacrifice; he confessed his sin; he promised and professed repentance; (to which he might have added; he prayed for pardon, and desired to be restored to favour;) but till all this was done and over, he was an improper person to partake of the table of God, who was justly conceived to be displeased. And this he gives as the reason why the offerer did not eat any share

share of his sacrifice. Now all, that the Author here says, is true; and yet, it is not a sufficient reason, why the offender should not have had a share of the sacrifice which he offered for his sin, for his own use; or the comfort of, what the Author calls, the symbol of friendship with God, *viz.* the eating with him at his table. The reason is obvious and evident, *viz.* because all, that the Author speaks of, was done and over, before the sacrificial animal was either slain or offered in sacrifice; and therefore, being done and over, its not being done and over could be no reason why the penitent offender should not have a share of the sacrifice, which he offered for his sin, to eat. On the contrary, since reconciliation and favour were actually obtained by the means aforesaid, before the sacrifice was slain or offered, this was a good reason why the offerer should have had a share of his sacrifice to eat; provided his eating of it was a symbol of friendship with God, or a fœderal rite by which he renewed friendship with him. The reason therefore, which the Author gives for the owners of piacular sacrifices having no share of these sacrifices to eat, is no reason at all for it; so far from it, that it is, upon the Author's own principles, a good reason why they should have had a share of them to eat.—This shews us again, how much the Author is puzzled with the difficulties
which

which attend his notion of the symbolical use and design of sacrifices, when he attempts to accommodate and apply it to piacular sacrifices.

Again, the Author says, that the offender, who offered a piacular sacrifice, looked upon himself as in a state of offence;—considered himself as guilty; and, therefore, could not presume to eat as a friend with God, but acted as under a sense of guilt, *viz.* by forbearing to eat. And still to the same purpose, he was too much a criminal in his own opinion, to be admitted to God's table immediately.—In these words, the Author seems to make the offender's own opinion or sense of his guilt, the reason why he had no share of the piacular sacrifice, which he offered for his sin, for his own use. But this, I think, is both unsupported by, and inconsistent with, the declarations of holy scripture. In the law of Moses, we find, that God ordered all piacular sacrifices, either to be wholly burnt and consumed with fire; or some parts of them to be thus consumed, and the whole remainder to be applied towards the maintenance of the priests; by which injunctions it was determined, that the owners or offerers of these sacrifices should have no share of them to eat. The offerers therefore of them, whether they had, or had not, a sense of their guilt, could have no share for their own use.

Their

Their not eating, did not depend on their opinion or sense of their guilt, but on the command and appointment of God, who had ordered those sacrifices to be disposed of another way. Perhaps, I cannot express my sentiments, on this head, better, than in the Author's own words, who saith
 " What could not be vowed to God, nor
 " was the effect of free-will in the giver,
 " but was a demand upon him for some
 " offence, or for some impropriety, could
 " not any ways, in part or in whole, be
 " taken back, as if the owner had any pro-
 " perty in it; nor could it be any way
 " with-held. It was all due to another,
 " and, therefore, the person that offered,
 " or presented it, could have no share or
 " portion in it. In sin and trespass-offer-
 " ings, therefore, the offerer could have
 " no pretence to any share in them; for
 " that would have been, in effect, a draw-
 " back upon what was, by law, given for
 " particular services." This language of
 the Author is perfectly agreeable to that of
 the Levitical-law; but the reverse of that
 which we find in those passages of his book
 which I have been considering, though
 found in their near neighbourhood.

Secondly. The Author says, " When a
 " man offered a burnt-offering, or a peace-
 " offering,

" offering, a meat and drink-offering was
 " made likewise ". And he says fur-
 ther, " The reason why a meat and drink-
 " offering were annexed to these two kinds
 " of sacrifices, is, the symbols of friendship
 " were offered. " — In these two passages
 he intimates, that a meat and drink-offering
 were annexed to all burnt-offerings and
 peace-offerings; and that the oblation of
 these to God, being the oblation of meat
 and drink to him, was the oblation of the
 symbols of friendship to him: so that, ac-
 cording to the Author, burnt-offerings
 themselves, with their appurtenances, as
 well as the peace-offerings, were symbols
 of friendship with God; or fœderal rites
 by which he and the offerers engaged in,
 renewed, and kept up friendship with one
 another.

A N S W E R.

Our Author ought to have considered, that
 no meat-offering, nor drink-offering, was
 annexed to those burnt-offerings which con-
 stituted a part of the trespass-offerings, (ex-
 cepting only the trespass-offerings offered by
 the leper, Levit. xiv.) This is evident from
 Levit. v. 7--10.--xii. 8.--xv. 14, 15; 29, 30.
 And it is acknowledged by the Author him-
 self,

self, who saith expressly, "The sin-offering
" and the trespass-offering had no meat-of-
" fering nor drink-offering accompanying
" them. *."—The burnt-offerings, there-
fore, which were offered for trespasses, not
having any meat-offering or drink-offering
(which our Author calls, the symbols of
friendship) annexed to them, could not
be symbols of friendship, or fœderal rites
by which God and the offerers engaged
in, renewed, or kept up friendship with one
another.

Our Author ought, likewise, to have re-
membred, that it is not the meat-offering,
nor the drink-offering, nor any part of the
apparatus of a table, whether flesh, bread,
or wine, but eating and drinking together,
that he considers as being the symbol of
friendship betwixt God and the offerers of
sacrifice. And if this be true; it cannot,
at the same time, be true, that, when a
meat-offering and a drink-offering were of-
fered to God, the symbols of friendship were
offered to him: and, therefore, his menti-
oning them as being symbols of friendship,
which were offered to God, is a real depar-
ture from his own system.

Withal, where a meat-offering and a
drink-offering were annexed to burnt-offe-
rings,

ings, yet even here, God and the offerers did not eat or drink together : and therefore, burnt-offerings, even taken in connection with those their appendages, neither were, nor could be, in our Author's sense, symbols of friendship, or fœderal rites by which God and the offerers engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship by eating and drinking together.

Thirdly. The last, and indeed, the main thing, which our Author advances, in order to shew that his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices is applicable to piacular sacrifices, is, that peace-offerings were, in all cases, joined to those sacrifices of which the owners had no share to eat. To this purpose he saith, " There were, from
 " the earliest times, even from the flood,
 " burnt-offerings ; and probably peace-offer-
 " ings were added to them. For as the burnt-
 " offerings were totally consumed, the party
 " sacrificing could not eat of them. They
 " joined therefore to them, or had in use, as
 " early as Jacob's days at least, sacrifices of
 " which they partook, and thus did eat with
 " God y." *Again,* " If one may argue
 " from what was in use under the Mosaic
 " institution, to the customs before that
 " time, one may reasonably conclude, that
 " peace-offerings were always annexed to
 burnt-

APPENDIX II. 289

“ burnt-offerings, even from the beginning.
 “ —For holocausts were to deprecate the
 “ wrath of God ; and peace-offerings were,
 “ after a reconciliation with God was made,
 “ to eat, as it were, at God’s table, and to
 “ be in a state of friendship with him. And
 “ this is the reason why they were so regu-
 “ larly, and, I think, constantly, joined to-
 “ gether in all private sacrifices under the
 “ Mosaic dispensation ^z.” Again, “ When
 “ he had made this offering, (*i. e.* a burnt-
 “ offering,) and expressed his repentance,
 “ he joined to the burnt-offering his peace-
 “ offering.—The latter was considered as a
 “ reconciliation made, and a restoration to
 “ favour, and a partaking of the Lord’s ta-
 “ ble, and an eating of it as friends ^a. And
 “ still to the same purpose, “ Hence too
 “ we may see the reason why a sin-offering
 “ being made, they offered a burnt-offering
 “ with it, with its meat-offering and drink-
 “ offering. The first was to remove the of-
 “ fence given by some particular crime ; the
 “ other was to shew a desire of reconcilia-
 “ tion by renouncing all sin that a man
 “ might have been guilty of ; and when
 “ to these was afterwards added a peace-
 “ offering, this implied an actual reconcilia-

U
“ tion

^z Page 252. ^a p. 277, 278. ^b p. 284.

“ tion by partaking of the same common
 “ table^b.”

A N S W E R.

The Author's conjecture, that peace-offerings were added to the burnt-offerings which had been offered before the days of Jacob, I have considered before ; and have nothing to add to what I have already said, excepting this, that customs, being arbitrary, and of a very variable nature, there is no arguing from the customs which prevail in one part of the world, to the customs which take place in another part of it ; much less from the customs which obtain in one age, to the customs which may have obtained in preceeding and distant ages.

The Author, in the passages here quoted, and all along, acknowledgeth, that the owners of all piacular sacrifices, whether burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, or trespass-offerings, had no share of these sacrifices to eat or drink. And the fact, which he thus acknowledgeth, is abundantly supported by scripture-evidence. Now, if the owners of these sacrifices had no share of them to eat or drink, 'tis plain, that God and they did not eat or drink together ; and, consequently, that these sacrifices were not, in the Author's sense, symbols of friendship, or fœderal rites by which he and they did engage in, or re-
 new

new friendship by eating and drinking together.

But to get rid of this difficulty, the Author says, "that peace-offerings were regularly and constantly joined to burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, in all private sacrifices;" and that, in these peace-offerings, God and the owners did eat together, which eating together was a symbol of friendship betwixt them, or a fœderal rite by which he and they engaged in and renewed friendship with one another. Now if all, that the Author here contends for, should be granted to him, yet it is still manifest, that God and the owners did not eat together of any of the piacular sacrifices mentioned; and that the peace-offerings, which were joined to these, were the only sacrifices of which he and they did eat together: consequently, these peace-offerings were the only sacrifices which could, in the Author's sense, be symbols of friendship, or fœderal rites by which he and they did engage in, and renew friendship by eating together: for, as to the piacular sacrifices, to which these peace-offerings were joined, it is, in the nature of the thing, impossible, that they should have been symbols or fœderal rites of this kind, because the owners had no share of them to eat.

But, what is still worse for the Author, is, that though he affirms roundly that peace-offerings were regularly and constantly joined to all private sacrifices of the piacular kind, under the Mosaic dispensation; yet, in truth, there was no piacular sacrifice of a private nature, under that dispensation, (excepting those which were offered by the Nazarite, when the days of his purification were fulfilled, Numb. vi. 14.) which had peace-offerings joined to them. This appears from Levit. iv. 22—35.—Chap. v.—Chap. vi. 1—7. Chap. ix. 2, 8—14. and Chapters xii. xiv. xv. and Chap. xv. 3, 6, 11—14, 24, 27. Yea, even in some of the public piacular sacrifices, it doth not appear, that any peace-offering was joined to them. *Vide* Levit. iv. 13—21.—xvi. 5, 7—9, 15, 24, 27. Now since the owners of piacular sacrifices had no share of them to eat; and since the piacular sacrifices, just now mentioned, both private and public, had no peace-offerings joined to them; the shift, which the Author uses to get rid of the difficulty, can avail him nothing: nor enable him to shew, that the many piacular sacrifices, which had no peace-offerings joined to them, were in his sense, symbols of friendship betwixt God and the offerers, or fœderal rites by which he and they engaged in, or renewed friendship, by eating together.

But

But that which bears hardest of all upon the Author, is, that, even in peace-offerings themselves, as I have shewed before, God and the owners did not eat or drink together. And, therefore, if it were true, as it is not, that peace-offerings had, in all cases, been joined to piacular sacrifices, this would not have relieved the Author from the difficulty with which he is pressed, nor have enabled him to prove that any kind of sacrifice, whether piacular or eucharistical, was a symbol of friendship in his sense, or a fœderal rite by which God and the offerer engaged in, renewed, or kept up friendship with one another, by eating or drinking together.

I have now considered and examined all those passages, in which the Author endeavours to shew, that his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices is applicable to piacular sacrifices, of which the owners had no share to eat or drink: and have, I think, made it abundantly evident, that all that he has advanced in those passages, as a proof of this point, only serves to exhibit the confusion and distress into which he is brought by his attempt to prove it.

THE CONCLUSION.

In the foregoing sheets, I have, I think, proved, that the Author's notions of the nature and design of sacrifices are neither uniform nor consistent: that he has failed in the proof of the grand fact, which is the basis of his whole system, *viz.* That eating and drinking together, was, at the time when sacrifices first began to be offered, a fœderal rite, or a known, customary rite by which men engaged in, renewed, and kept up friendships with one another: that, supposing it to have been, at that time, a rite which was used among men for these purposes, yet it is not natural to conceive, that they would have taken the same method, and observed the same rite, in engaging in, and renewing friendship with God; and that the pretended evidence, by which the Author endeavours to prove that they actually did this, is, in all its parts, faulty, weak, and fallacious: and, finally, that his notion of the symbolical nature and design of sacrifices is such as can be brought to no consistency or agreement either with the nature of God, or with real fact, that is, with the way and manner in which, the scripture informs us, the things which were offered in sacrifice were disposed of.—

A P P E N D I X II. 295

of.—These premises will, I think, warrant and support this conclusion, *viz.* That the Author's system, in all its parts, is not only unsupported by evidence, but absurd and unscriptural.

Having now finished my design, I shall not encroach any further upon the time and patience of the ingenious reader ; but conclude this appendix with my sincere desire, that it may answer my end in writing it, by being a mean of guarding men against a chimerical and unscriptural notion of the use and design of sacrifices, and of putting those of learning and capacity upon inquiries after the true scripture-doctrine about the nature and end of these institutions, which are the only things I aim at.

T H E E N D.



BOOKE printed for C. HENDERSON, under
the *Royal-Exchange*.

I. **R**ecovery from sickness: a present to one lately
rallied from a dangerous disorder. Contain-
ing serious reflections, resolutions and devotions suit-
able to that occasion. The third Edition. Price
3d.

II. A Survey of a search after souls, 1 vol. 8vo. By
Caleb Fleming. 4s.

III. Protestant System, containing discourses on the
principal doctrines of natural and revealed religion,
compiled from the works of above twenty dissenting
ministers, 2 vols. 8vo. 10s.

IV. A Journal of eight days journey, interspersed
with miscellaneous reflections, moral and religious,
in sixty-four letters addressed to two ladies of the party;
to which is added an essay on tea, and thoughts on
publick love. By *Jonas Hanway*, Esq; 2 vols. 8vo.
10s.

V. A new call to the unconverted. 1s.

VI. An essay on the duty and office of a constable.
By *Saunders Welch*, Esq; 1s.

VII. Rural Beauties, 1 vol. 12mo. 3s.

VIII. Bailey's English Dictionary. 8vo. 6s.

IX. Burkitt on the New Testament. Folio.

X. Beveridge's Works, 10 vols. 8vo.

XI. Boyer's Telemachus. 2 vols.

XII. Biographia Britannica.

XIII. Drillincourt on the Fears of Death.

XIV. Esop's Fables by Mr. Richardson.

XV. Henry on the Bible. Folio.

XVI. Hay's Negociator's Magazine.

XVII. Langham's Neat Duties.

XVIII. Mrs. Rowe's Works. 2 vols. 12mo.

XIX. Natural History of Iceland.

XX. A Treatise on the pernicious custom of giving
Vails to Servants. 1s.

XXI. Sermons on various and important Subjects.
By the late Rev. Mr. *Thomas Newman*. 2 vols. 8vo.
10s

LIBRARY

1811

REV. GWILK THOMAS, D. D.

LIVERPOOL.

PURCHASED AND PRESENTED BY

MR WILLIAM THOMAS



81

3
.
.